

THE CLERGY REVIEW

PATRONS.

His Eminence CARDINAL BOURNE,
Archbishop of Westminster.

His Eminence CARDINAL MACRORY,
Archbishop of Armagh.

**Their Graces the ARCHBISHOPS OF CARDIFF, TUAM, CASHEL,
BIRMINGHAM, AND ST. ANDREWS AND EDINBURGH.**

EDITORIAL BOARD.

The Most Rev. RICHARD DOWNEY, D.D., Ph.D., LL.D.,
Archbishop of Liverpool (Chairman).

**The Presidents of the English Seminaries at home and abroad—
Ushaw, Oscott, Upholland, Womersley; Rome (Venerable
English College, and Collegio Beda), Valladolid, Lisbon,
and the Joint Editors:**

The Right Rev. Mgr. E. CANON MYERS, M.A.,
President of St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, Ware.

The Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.,
Vice-President of St. Joseph's College, Upholland.

With the collaboration of:

The Right Rev. Mgr. CANON GEORGE, D.D., Ph.D.,
and

The Rev. JOHN P. ARENDZEN, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

CONTENTS

SEPTEMBER, 1931

ARTICLES :—

	PAGE
1. The Origins of the European Scientific Tradition : St. Thomas and Roger Bacon, By CHRISTOPHER DAWSON	193
2. Christ in the Koran, By Professor Dr. ALBERT SLEUMER	206
3. " Bakerism " at Douay Seminary, By the Rev. JUSTIN MCCANN, O.S.B., M.A.	213
4. The Catholic Conference of Higher Studies, By the Rev. HUGH POPE, O.P., D.S.S.	227
5. The Human Appearance of Christ, By the Rev. BERNARD LEEMING, S.J.	234
6. " Men of Little Showing " (4), Provost Walmsley, By the Rev. CUTHBERT WARING, M.A.	242
7. Plainsong for the People, By the Rev. A. G. McDONALD	248

HOMILETICS :—

By the Rev. H. E. CALNAN, D.D.	255
--	-----

NOTES ON RECENT WORK :—

(1) Liturgy and Ceremonial, By the Very Rev. M. S. CANON MACMAHON, B.A.	264
(2) Ascetical and Mystical Theology, By the Very Rev. DOM BENEDICT STEUART, O.S.B.	269

ROMAN DOCUMENTS :—

By the Rev. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.	276
---	-----

BOOK REVIEWS	278
------------------------	-----

REVIEW OF REVIEWS	281
-----------------------------	-----

CORRESPONDENCE	285
--------------------------	-----

PROPRIETORS.

" THE UNIVERSE "

(Associated Catholic Newspapers, 1912, Ltd.)

1, Arundel Street, London, W.C.2.

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE ORIGINS OF THE EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC TRADITION: ST. THOMAS AND ROGER BACON

BY CHRISTOPHER DAWSON.

THE thirteenth century has been regarded, not without reason, as the culminating point of the Middle Ages—the crown of the preceding six centuries of development of Christian civilization. Nevertheless, if it was a culmination it was also a turning point: it was the age when the old tradition of the unity of Christendom under the double headship of Pope and Emperor passed away for ever, and when the centrifugal forces which became dominant in the later middle ages were already asserting their power. The century that opens with Innocent III closes with Boniface VIII and Philip IV.

It is especially important to remember this aspect of the thirteenth century when we are dealing with its intellectual history. For St. Thomas has become so complete a representative of medieval thought that we are apt to simplify the whole process of development and to interpret it from an exclusively Thomist point of view. In reality St. Thomas was far less representative of medieval thought than is usually supposed. His philosophy is not the mature fruit of the old medieval tradition, but the first fruits of the new scientific thought. He was a bold innovator, who, as M. Gilson has said, always chose the line of greatest resistance and made a decisive break in the continuity of the medieval tradition.

If we wish to find a typical representation of medieval thought, we should look not to St. Thomas but to St. Bonaventura. It is he who summed up with masterly genius the intellectual heritage of Western Christendom

and created a synthesis which incorporates all the vital elements of medieval thought. It was the work of St. Thomas to launch the Western mind on a new path that it had not known hitherto: to vindicate the autonomous rights of reason and to create a scientific philosophy which rested on purely rational foundations and was, not like the earlier scholasticism, a philosophic superstructure superimposed on a basis of Christian dogma. Thus St. Thomas looks forward to the Renaissance rather than back to the Middle Ages, and it was not until the sixteenth century that he was recognized as the official doctor of the Church and found worthy disciples in men like Cajetan, Vitoria and Suarez, who freed scholasticism from the sophistry and barbarism of the later medieval schoolmen.

The inaugurator of the new philosophy was the German, Albertus Magnus, the most learned man of the thirteenth century, and the most complete embodiment of the different intellectual currents of his age. He is the master, on the one hand, of St. Thomas and the Christian Aristotelians, and, on the other, of Ulrich of Strasburg, Dietrich of Freiberg, and the German mystics. His greatest achievement was to put the whole corpus of Græco-Arabic thought at the disposal of Western scholasticism through the encyclopædic series of commentaries and expositions by which, as he said, he made "all the parts of philosophy—physics, metaphysics and mathematics—intelligible to the Latins." Nor was he merely a passive intermediary between two intellectual traditions, like the translators of the previous century; he had a really original mind, and his scientific observations, above all in biology, botany and geology, may perhaps be regarded as the first independent achievements of Western European science. It is indeed in science rather than in philosophy that his originality is to be found. As a philosopher he tended rather to syncretism than to synthesis, and his philosophical works form a kind of metaphysical museum, in which theories of diverse origin and of inconsistent character find themselves side by side.

The true creator of the new synthesis was not the German encyclopædist, but his Neapolitan pupil, St. Thomas, through whom the mind of Western Christendom finally succeeded in completely incorporating the

intellectual heritage of the Aristotelian tradition. Nature had fitted him for his task. He was no child of the Gothic North, like Albert or Abelard, but a native of that strange borderland of Western civilization where feudal Europe mingled with the Greek and Saracen worlds. He sprang from a family of courtiers and troubadours, whose fortunes were intimately bound up with the brilliant half-oriental, half humanist court of the great emperor and his ill-fated successors—that court which was at once the cradle of Italian literature and one of the main channels through which Arabic science reached the Christian world. St. Thomas was born at the time when Michael Scot, under the patronage of the Emperor, was making the first Latin translations of the great Aristotelian commentaries of Averroes. He was educated at the University of Naples, the first university to owe its foundations and organization to the State, and he received his philosophical initiation from Peter of Ireland, one of the first Western scholastics to come under the influence of Averroistic thought. Nevertheless, St. Thomas was never a pupil of the Arabs in the same sense as the majority of his contemporaries. With him the Western mind emancipates itself from its Arabic teachers and returns to the sources. Indeed, there is in St. Thomas a real intellectual affinity to the Greek genius. More than any other Western thinker, mediaeval or modern, he possessed the tranquil lucidity and the gift of abstract intelligence that mark the Hellenic mind.

Thus he was peculiarly fitted to interpret the thought of Aristotle to his age, without either forcing it into the mould of an alien mentality or disregarding the autonomy and transcendence of the Christian faith. Unlike the many medieval thinkers, both Christian and oriental, who evolved a kind of theosophical syncretism that was irreconcilable alike with the ideal of religious faith and with that of a purely rational philosophy, St. Thomas was able to combine the Peripatetic tradition in philosophy and the patristic tradition in theology without falsifying either of them. It is true that his thought was Neoplatonic rather than Aristotelian in its concentration on spiritual reality and its consecration to a religious ideal.

Nevertheless although the mind of St. Thomas was steeped in the thought of St. Augustine and the

Pseudo-Dionysius, his philosophy marks a complete break with the old Augustinian-Neoplatonic idealism that had hitherto dominated the intellectual development of the West. Not only did St. Thomas accept the cardinal principles of Aristotelian physics, but he applied them resolutely to the nature of man, teaching that matter is the principle of human individuation and that the soul is the form of the body. Hence man is not, as the Platonists believed, a spiritual being temporarily confined in the prison of the flesh, a stranger in an alien world, he is a part of nature—that dynamic order which embraces the whole series of living beings from man to plant, as well as the things that are without life but not without their principle of form. Hence the human intelligence is not that of a pure spirit which exists only for the contemplation of absolute reality. It is consubstantial with matter, subject to the conditions of space and time, and it can only construct an intelligible order out of the data of sensible experience, systematized by the scientific activity of reason. And thus while, on the one hand, human reason is distinctly animal, the lowest and most obscured form of intelligence, on the other hand, it is the one principle of spiritual order in nature, and it is its essential function to reduce the unintelligible chaos of the material world to reason and order.

Moreover, man is not entirely confined to the inevitable cycle of generation and corruption. As an intelligent being his nature partakes of the spiritual and the eternal. The spiritual side of his nature demands its satisfaction, and since he is incapable of finding it in an immediate contact with spiritual reality, God has opened a channel by which He reveals and communicates Himself to man. Thus St. Thomas finds room for the whole economy of Christian redemption, as a second order, a spiritual creation with its own laws and its own principle of activity. This new order does not destroy or supersede nature; it is analogous and complementary to it; nor is it anti-rational, since it possesses a higher divine rationality of its own. The whole Thomist synthesis is governed by this principle of the concordance in difference of the two orders—of Nature and Grace, of Reason and Faith, of the temporal and the spiritual powers.

This is the essential significance of Thomism in the

history of European culture: it marks the end of the oriental and Byzantine absorption of the human mind in the absolute and the transcendent. It recognized the autonomous rights of the human reason and its scientific activity against the absolutism of a purely theological ideal of knowledge and the rights of human nature and natural morality against the exclusive domination of the ascetic ideal, while in social life it substituted for the all-embracing unity of the Byzantine and Islamic theocracy, the dual order of Church and State, each with its independent functions and its own principle of authority. Thus, though Thomism did far less for humane letters than the school of Chartres in the preceding century, it opened the way for humanism in the larger sense of the word, and though its scientific achievements were very inferior to those of the fourteenth century Nominalists, it opened the way for an autonomous and disinterested scientific activity.

The comparative sterility of Thomism in natural science has a twofold cause. On the one hand, it is due to its concentration on metaphysics and theology, and on the other, to the very completeness of its synthesis with the Aristotelian tradition. The Aristotelian corpus supplied the Middle Ages with an organized body of scientific knowledge far in advance of anything that Western culture had hitherto known, and consequently it was accepted as the last word in human wisdom.

In this respect Aristotelian scholasticism tended towards the standpoint of Averroes, who regards Aristotle as the divinely appointed hierophant of the mysteries of nature. "It is he," wrote the latter, "who has discovered the three sciences—Physics, Logic and Metaphysics, and who has completed them. He has discovered them, for what we find of this knowledge in the writings of the earlier authors is not worthy of being considered even as a part of this doctrine, and one can say without hesitation that it does not even contain the principles of it. He has completed them, for none of those that have come after him, even to the present day, has added anything to them; nor has anyone discovered in his words an error of any importance.

"Let us praise God, Who, in the domain of perfection, has singled out this man from all others and has conferred on him particularly the dignity of humanity car-

ried to its culminating point in such a measure as no man in any age has been able to reach."¹

Such an attitude was as fatal to scientific progress as the theological obscurantism of a Peter Damian or a Walter of St. Victor. The science of the Islamic world, which was far more advanced than anything that existed in Christian Europe, was brought to sterility by the two rival orthodoxies of the philosophers and the theologians. The infant science of the West was saved from this fate by the existence of a third party—that of the Augustinians, above all those of the order of St. Francis. This tradition was no more independent of oriental influences than was that of Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas. It also incorporated considerable Aristotelian elements, just as Thomism preserved a large element of Augustinianism. But while Thomism was the synthesis of Augustine and Aristotle, the so-called Augustinianism of the thirteenth century looked to Avicenna and Ibn Gebirol rather than to Averroes, and to the Neoplatonic interpreters of Aristotle rather than to the pure Peripatetic tradition: in other words, it was the synthesis of a synthesis.

The Augustinians differed from the true disciples of Aristotle above all in their theory of knowledge. Sensible experience only gives a knowledge of sensible things, but the higher knowledge springs from the illumination of the mind by divine truth, it is intuitive and spiritual. Hence the true source of knowledge is not to be found in things, but in the divine ideas, the *rationes aeternae*, that are the ultimate foundation of reality. And this Platonic theory of knowledge naturally leads to the Platonic, as opposed to the Aristotelian, theory of science. Though the Augustinians did not go so far as Plato, and deny that any science of sensible things was possible, they did tend to exalt the deductive over the inductive method, to regard mathematics as the model science and to prefer the sciences that make use of mathematical methods, such as optics and astronomy, to the non-mathematical Aristotelian sciences of physics and biology.

¹ From the preface to the *Great Commentary to Aristotle de Physico Auditu* and from the paraphrase to the *De generatione Animalium*, lib. 1. cap. 20, quoted by Mandonnet, Siger de Brabant, 1st ed., p. 153, and by Duhem op. cit. IV, pp. 310-11.

The most remarkable representative of this tendency was Robert Grosseteste, one of the most original and many-sided minds of the thirteenth century. Influenced on the one hand by the Neoplatonic and Augustinian conception of Light as a type of spiritual reality, and, on the other, by the Arabic works on optics and perspective of the great eleventh century mathematician, Ibn al Haitam (Alhazen), he attempted to deduce from the nature of light a complete cosmological theory. Light is not only the primary substance, it is the very cause of the extension of matter. It alone is auto-diffusive, for given a luminous point, it at once creates for itself a sphere of illumination. Thus it is the infinite dynamic energy of light that generates the finite *quantum* and confers on matter its form and dimensions.

This view of space as essentially the field of radiation of energy is curiously suggestive of modern physical theory, and no less modern is the scientific ideal of the mathematical explanation of nature which is associated with it in Grosseteste's philosophy. Since the laws of perspective—of optical geometry—are the foundation of physical reality, mathematics are the only path to the understanding of nature. "All causes of natural effects," he writes, "can be given by lines and angles and figures," and without them it is impossible to understand natural philosophy. "They hold good in the whole universe and in its parts absolutely."

These ideas are like the inspired guesses of the early Greek physicists. They were too far in advance of the contemporary state of science to bear immediate fruit, and it was not until the age of Galileo and Descartes that they were actually realizable. Nevertheless, the influence of Grosseteste on the thought of his age was far from being negligible. His scientific ideas, above all his faith in mathematical reasoning, influenced the direction of studies at the new University of Oxford, which he did so much to organize. Throughout the thirteenth century and the first half of the fourteenth, Oxford maintained the tradition of Augustinian philosophy and of "mathematical" science, and it was from Oxford that the remarkable development of scientific thought in France during the fourteenth century derived its inspiration. Moreover, it is difficult to overestimate the influence of Grosseteste's thought on the mind of one of the most

remarkable figures of the thirteenth century, whose fame has indeed overshadowed that of his master—I mean Roger Bacon.

It was from Grosseteste that Bacon derived not only his distinctive philosophical and scientific views, above all his conviction of the importance of mathematics, but also his interest in philology and in the study of Greek and the oriental languages. Yet if Bacon owed far more to his predecessors than has usually been supposed, his was none the less a profoundly original mind. But his originality is to be found less in his scientific theories than in his personality, and in his general attitude to contemporary thought. To a far greater extent than Grosseteste, he stands apart from the main current of scholastic philosophical study. He belongs rather to the tradition of the men of science, who were responsible for the introduction of Arabic science into the West, such as Adelard of Bath, Gerard of Cremona and Plato of Tivoli. It is true that he speaks with contempt of the translators, but this is owing to a somewhat exaggerated sense of their linguistic incompetence and not from any doubt as to the value of Arabic science, which he regards as the main channel by which Christendom could recover the wisdom of the ancient world. He resembles Adelard above all in his critical attitude to Western scholasticism: indeed he quotes the actual words of Adelard with regard to the danger of a blind reliance on authority that I have referred to in my previous article. In Bacon's view, the four fundamental obstacles to the progress of philosophy are dependance on authority, the influence of custom, the ignorance of the populace and the false pretensions of those who esteem themselves to be learned. He cannot find words strong enough to express his contempt for "these new theologians" of the teaching orders, who become masters in theology and philosophy before they have studied, and who console themselves for their ignorance by belittling the sciences and display their emptiness before the eyes of the ignorant multitude.

Yet although Bacon includes the great Dominicans, Albert and Thomas, in his wholesale condemnation, he is far from hostile to the new learning. He dismisses Alexander of Hales, precisely because the latter had had no training in Aristotelian physics and metaphysics "which are the glory of our modern studies." The

works of Aristotle are for him "the foundation of all wisdom," and he blames his contemporaries, not for their cultivation of Aristotelian science, but for their misunderstanding and corruption of it.

Still less can we regard his attitude to scholasticism and authority as a rationalistic attempt to free natural science from its dependence on theology. In this respect he is distinctly reactionary in comparison with St. Thomas. The unity of science in which he believes is a purely theological unity. To an even greater extent than the earlier Augustinians he is prepared to subordinate all human knowledge to the divine wisdom that is contained in the scriptures. All knowledge springs ultimately from revelation. The first and most perfect scientists were the patriarchs, and the philosophers of the Gentiles merely collected the crumbs that had fallen from the tables of Sem and Abraham and Solomon. He admits the possibility of scientific progress, for there is no finality in this life, and knowledge must continue to increase with the growing experience of mankind. But this progress is like the development of Christian dogma; it is the unfolding of an original deposit that is implicitly contained in the primitive revelation. Thus, he says that Aristotle failed to explain the phenomenon of the rainbow because he was ignorant of its final cause—the dissipation of aqueous vapour—a principle which is laid down in the book of Genesis.

This extreme traditionalism seems at first sight irreconcilable with his theory of experimental science which has often been regarded as an anticipation of the modern scientific ideal. But Bacon's experimental science is not the verification of hypothesis by experiment, the inductive method which Aristotle describes so admirably in the *Posterior Analytics*; it is primarily the realization of science in practical results. It is the knowledge that teaches man to transmute metals, to read the future in the stars and to prolong human life for centuries.

His exaltation of experimental science is at root utilitarian. It is to be an instrument to secure the triumph of Christendom over the infidel, and to prepare for the coming struggle with the forces of Anti-Christ. For he shared the apocalyptic ideas of his age—the age of Joachim of Flora and the Franciscan spirituals—and these ideas were blended in his mind with the belief,

derived from the Abu Maschar and the Eastern astrologers, of a "horoscope of religions" in which the various conjunctions of the planets presage the successive rise and fall of the world religions.² All the signs, he believed, pointed to the approaching end of the age and to the coming of Antichrist, and it was to arm Christendom for the struggle and to prepare the way for its renovation under the leadership of a great Pope and a great king that he propounded his schemes for the reform of studies and the utilization of the power of science.

Thus Bacon was no devotee of pure science. His attitude is fundamentally far less scientific than that of Aristotle or even that of St. Thomas. But though this detracts from his greatness as a thinker, it does nothing to diminish his personal originality and his historical significance. It is true that he does not dominate his age with the commanding authority of an Aquinas, he seems at first sight to stand outside it altogether as a kind of intellectual outlaw. Nevertheless, it would hardly be an exaggeration to maintain that it was not St. Thomas, the pure intellectualist, but Roger Bacon, the scientific visionary and the reputed inventor of gunpowder, who was the typical representative of the new tendencies of European thought. The former looks backward to the classical perfection of the Hellenic-Mediterranean tradition, the latter forward to the brilliant and disorderly progress of the Western mind. For, after all, it is not the Hellenic ideal of pure science—the construction of an intelligible order—but Bacon's ideal of science as an instrument of world conquest and exploitation which is that of the modern world. When Bacon sings the praises of the experimental science that can create automobiles and flying machines and devices that will destroy a whole army in a single instant, he is the prophet of modern science, and his visions have been more than realised in these days of aeroplanes and poison gas: though whether Christendom has been so much the gainer by it all as he believed, is another question.

But if this is one side of the truth, it is not the whole

² Thus the conjunction of Jupiter with Mars marks the rise of the religion of the Chaldeans, with the sun that of the Egyptians, with Venus that of the Saracens, with Mercury that of the Christians, and finally the conjunction of Jupiter with the Moon marks the coming of Antichrist. *De Viciis Contractis in Studio Theologie* ed. Steele, pp. 43-50.

truth. In reality both of these elements contributed to the formation of the European scientific tradition. The pragmatic experimentation of the Baconian ideal could have borne no fruit apart from the intellectual training and discipline which were provided by Aristotelian scholasticism. And the latter might have smothered the initiative of scientific thought under the weight of its traditional authority had it not been for the independent criticism of Bacon and the experimentalists. St. Thomas had vindicated the autonomous rights of reason and scientific enquiry against the theological absolutism of the early Middle Ages. Bacon in turn intervened to safeguard the independence of science from metaphysical absolutism of the philosophers.

Pierre Duhem has shown that the teaching of Bacon was by no means so sterile and lacking in influence as it has usually been supposed. His followers included some of the leading writers on astronomy in the next generation—Bernard of Verdun, William St. Cloud and John of Sicily, not to mention Pierre d'Ailly at a much later period. And apart from this direct influence, the spirit of his teaching and of his appeal from authority to experience survives in the tradition of critical and scientific Nominalism which became the dominant force in the intellectual life of the following century. The schoolmen of the fourteenth century—William of Ockham, John Buridan, Albert of Saxony and Nicholas Oresme—are at once the heirs of Roger Bacon and the forerunners of Copernicus and Leonardo da Vinci.

In the second half of the thirteenth century the vital conflict was not between science and the theological dogmatism of the traditionalists, but between the science of experience and the *a priori* rationalism of Averroes and the strict Aristotelians. And curiously enough, the struggle was fought on the same issue as that of the great conflict between science and authority centuries later—the validity of the Ptolemaic astronomy: only in this case the rôles were inverted and it was the defenders of Ptolemy who stood for scientific progress and the experimental method.³

³ The controversy between the Aristotelian and Ptolemaic traditions has been dealt with exhaustively by P. Duhem: indeed it is the central theme of his great unfinished work, *Le Système du Monde de Platon à Copernic*. Cf. esp. Vol. II, Vol. III, Chap. v-vii, and Vol. IV, Chap. viii.

Ptolemaic astronomy was purely a science of observation. It involved no philosophical presuppositions. It sought only to provide an hypothesis which would account for all the facts of observation, or, as the Greeks put it, would "save appearances"—*σώζειν τὰ φαινόμενα*—and thus provide a basis for accurate calculations and tables. The Aristotelians, on the other hand, claimed that science must do more than "save appearances," it must explain their real nature and cause, and consequently must be founded on the principles of physics. Now Aristotelian physics demanded that the movements of the heavenly bodies should be absolutely circular and uniform, and that they should revolve round a motionless centre of gravity which could be no other than the Earth, the centre of the Universe.

This system of homocentric spheres was, however, in conflict with the science of observation which showed that the planets were not always at the same distance from the earth, and consequently the practical astronomers, such as Hipparchus and Ptolemy, rejected the theory of Eudoxus and Aristotle, and worked out the elaborate Ptolemaic system of eccentrics and epicycles which was capable of explaining all the known facts and of providing a satisfactory basis for scientific calculation. Henceforward there was a division of opinion between the astronomers and mathematicians on the one side, and the philosophers and physicists on the other. The practical advantages of the Ptolemaic system ensured its general acceptance, but the Aristotelians regarded it as a provisional hypothesis which might, as St. Thomas says, be eventually replaced by a more satisfactory theory. And in fact, the revival of strict Aristotelianism in Spain during the twelfth century was accompanied by a resolute effort to supersede the Ptolemaic theory by one that was fully consistent with Aristotelian principles, and finally, in the *Theory of the Planets* of Al Bitrogi, this achieved a considerable measure of success. The work of Al Bitrogi was translated into Latin by Michael Scot in 1217, and thenceforward until the end of the century his theory was the subject of constant debate in the schools of the West. Practical astronomers such as Campanus of Novara remained faithful to the Ptolemaic theory, but the philosophers and the physicists tended to favour Al Bitrogi's theory as more in harmony with the teachings

of Aristotle. This is true, not only of avowed Peripatians such as Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas, but also of the followers of the Augustinian tradition, such as Robert Grosseteste and St. Bonaventura, though the latter seems to have been influenced by Averroes rather than by Al Bitrogi. Even Roger Bacon himself, with characteristic inconsistency, proved in this instance false to his own principles and hesitated to accept the evidence of scientific observation when it contradicted the principles of Aristotelian physics. It was left to Bacon's disciple, the Franciscan, Bernard of Verdun, to vindicate his principles by submitting the rival theories to the test of experience and thus establishing the superiority of the Ptolemaic system.

Bernard's demonstration prevailed first in the Franciscan order, and afterwards at the University of Paris and throughout the West (although Al Bitrogi's theory enjoyed a temporary revival among the Italian Averroists of the Renaissance). It marks the end of the period of dependence upon the Arabs and the beginning of the independent development of Western science. In the schoolmen of the fourteenth century, who belong rather to the tradition of Bacon than to that of St. Thomas—William Ockam, John Buridan, Albert of Saxony, and Nicholas Oresme—we find not only a critical reaction against the authority of the Aristotelian and Arabic tradition, but also a movement of original scientific research, which prepares the way for the coming of Copernicus and the new European science of the Renaissance.

CHRIST IN THE KORAN

BY PROFESSOR DR. ALBERT SLEUMER.

[*Translation from the German by Elsie Codd.*]

AT a rough estimate, there are some two hundred millions of Mohammedans in the world to-day. The spirit of modern scepticism, it is true, has spread also to the East, decimating the serried ranks of Islam and depleting the mosques of their worshippers, so that but one-third of those in Damascus are still visited by men, and only twenty-five per cent. of those in Constantinople. As in the older type of synagogues, the place assigned to the women is screened off from the rest of the building, and it is there they assemble—not in very impressive numbers, it must be owned—on the official day of prayer (Friday). Mahomet discarded the Sunday of the Christians in favour of Friday because, according to his teaching, Adam was created on a Friday and Adam was the first “true-believing” Mussulman.

However, despite these typical manifestations of the spirit of the age, the Koran still remains the Sacred Book to countless followers of the “Prophet,” a book not only to be read and conned, but also to be learnt by heart. Practically the entire course of theological study at the Azhar University of Cairo, founded in 988 by Caliph el-Aziz, consists in this memorizing of the Koran, and some hundreds of official teachers are employed in coaching students in this branch of learning. The teacher assembles a little crowd of neophytes around him and, seated with his class on a carpet spread on the ground—for these vast and spacious halls of learning boast neither desks nor forms—he proceeds to read aloud to them some chosen passage, which they repeat after him again and again, until it has been duly committed to memory. It is also the teacher’s business to expound those obscurer utterances of the Prophet that call for further elucidation. In addition to this course of theology, the curriculum includes a variety of other subjects, such as rhetoric, logic, mathematics, jurisprudence, history, geography, and so forth. The students, who are representative of

every tribe in Islam, Turks, Syrians, Mesopotamians, Indians and Sudanese, are lodged in buildings forming part of the University, the cost of their keep being defrayed by pious foundations, which bring in about £92,500 per annum. The entire course of study is absolutely free and gratis and lasts about seventeen years, the first examination taking place after the student has put in eleven years of study.

The Koran is a collection of Mahomet's discourses and teachings covering a period of some ten years. These were compiled from Mahomet's own lips by his followers, and it was he who gave the completed work the name by which it is still known, Koran meaning a recitation or reading. Abu Bekr, Mahomet's successor, was the first to assemble the various sections without, however, attempting to invest the result with any sense of unity. The work underwent further revision and "editing" at the hands of Othman, the third Caliph (Successor), who divided it up into 114 Suras (chapters or sections) about A.D. 950, without, however, arranging them in any kind of chronological order.

In a very few centuries after the Prophet's death, his followers had already split themselves up into the two camps of the Sunnites and the Shiites. In their attitude towards the teaching of the Koran, these two camps may be said to represent much the same standpoint as that of Catholics and Protestants in regard to the Bible. Adherents of the Sunna (custom, divine law) accepted in addition to the doctrines laid down by the Koran the traditions handed down from the earliest times, and considered themselves to be the true believers of Islam (resignation, i.e. to God's Will). The Shiites, for their part, rejected most of these traditions, and, as supporters of the claims of Ali, the Fourth Caliph (who had married Mahomet's daughter Fatima, but who was murdered before his status received official recognition), demanded that the Prophet's successors should be chosen solely from his descendants in the direct line. They accordingly refused to recognise the "Caliphs" Abu Bekr, Omar or Othman, whom they considered usurpers. The Shiah (sect) still has its adherents, notably amongst the Moham-medans of Persia, and was proclaimed the official religion of that country about 1500.

The Koran being to most people a book with seven seals, it might be of interest to investigate what precisely is its attitude, and consequently that of Mohammedanism, towards Christ and His teaching. In this connection it must be borne in mind that more than six hundred years had elapsed between the Birth of Christ and Mahomet's appearance on the scene. When he first saw the light on April 20th, 571, the Christian Church had already established in a number of great Ecclesiastical Councils the teaching of Our Lord in its minutest bearings on a thoroughly explicit theological basis, and had condemned alike the Arians who denied Christ's Divinity and detractors of that Divinity, such as the Nestorians, Monophysites and Monothelites. In South-Western Africa, Mesopotamia and Arabia, there were constant conflicts between Christianity, Judaism and the primitive religion of the Arabs, the last-named being a curious medley of idolatry, astrology and Zoroastrianism, with some traces of the influence of Christianity.

Keenly observant and mentally alert, Mahomet, who had visited Arabia in his earlier days of merchant adventure, resolved when he came into his own to stamp out idolatry and its attendant religious chaos.

In the teaching he handed down to his scribes, the "Prophet" had had frequent recourse to the Christian Gospels, which, however, in his reading and interpretations, have been subjected to certain drastic alterations. Christ Himself is mentioned in thirteen parts of the Koran, sometimes as Isa (Jesus), sometimes as Marsih (Messiah), again as the Son of Maryam (Mary), and even as the "Word of God." The sections dealing more particularly with Our Lord are entitled The Cow (Sura 2), The House of Imran (Sura 3), Woman (Sura 4), The Table (Sura 5), Maryam (Sura 19) and Ornaments of Gold (Sura 43). Reference is made in these sections to Christ's Incarnation and Nativity, His Work and His Passion.

Whilst conceding that Our Lord possessed apostolic and prophetic dignity, Mahomet repudiates His Divinity as rank heresy, and rejects the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity as derogatory to the "Oneness" of the Almighty.

Representing himself as one addressed by God, the "Prophet" deals in Sura 19 with the mystery of the Incarnation as follows:

Make mention in the Book of Mary, when she went apart from her family¹ eastward. And shrouded herself from them with a veil. And we sent our spirit to her, and he took before her the form of a perfect man. Mary said: "I fly for refuge from thee to the God of Mercy. If thou fearest Him, begone." He said: "I am only a messenger of thy Lord, that I may bestow on thee a holy son." Mary made reply: "How shall I have a son, when I know no man, neither am I unchaste." He made reply and said: "So shall it be. Thy Lord hath said: 'Easy is this with me; he shall be a sign to mankind and a testimony of our mercy. For it is a thing decreed.'" And Mary conceived a son and retired with him to a far-off place.

As is seen above, the Koran makes Jerusalem, not Nazareth, the scene of the Incarnation, and in Mahomet's rendering the Archangel Gabriel becomes the Holy Ghost in human form.

Arabian commentators are somewhat at variance regarding the time that elapsed between the Annunciation and the Nativity. According to some it was nine months, whilst others speak of one month and some of a single hour.

Sura 19 also records the Nativity in the following words:

And the throes came upon her by the trunk of a palm.

The stable as the Christian symbol of lowliness and humility here gives place to the palm, emblem of triumph and victory, though, as in the Bible, Bethlehem is mentioned as the place where Our Saviour was born. The date, according to Mohammedan tradition, was the 29th day of the Coptic month of Kijahk (December), the day of the week being a Monday. The legends add that the date-palm, which for seventy years had borne no fruit, became endued with new life at the Nativity and that the Child said to His Mother: "Shake the tree. Eat, drink and refresh thine eyes (be of good cheer)."

The Divinity of Christ is categorically denied in the following passages of the Koran:

They say: "God hath a Son." No! Praise be to Him! But—His whatever is in the Heavens and the Earth! All obeyeth Him. Jesus is as Adam in the sight of God. He

¹ That portion of the Temple where the altar stood on which the Jewish sacrifices were offered and where the so-called Dome of Rock (Kubbetes-Sachra), the Omar Mosque now stands, erected in 692. It also contained the outer court for the women.

created him of dust and said to him : " Be "—and he was. Those who say that Maryam's son is a God are infidels. The Messiah Himself said : " Ye sons of Israel, worship my Lord and yours! "—God once asked Jesus, the son of Maryam : " Didst thou ever say to men : ' Regard me and my mother as gods? ' " To which Jesus replied : " Nay, never, I swear it by Thy glory. How could I assert that which is untrue? Did I say such things, Thou wouldst know it, for Thou beholdest the secret places of my heart, whereas I know not Thy inmost thoughts. Thou alone dost comprehend all that is hidden and dost fathom all mysteries." God hath no offspring. If it pleases Him to create a thing, He has but to say : " Be," and it is. They surely are infidels who say : " God is the third of three."

In addition to above passages, an entire Sura (112) is devoted to the Mohammedan doctrine of the " Oneness " of God. As there were a good many Arians amongst the Arabian Christians of Mahomet's time, it is extremely likely that he took over this doctrine from them or from the Ebionitic Gnostics, who likewise denied the Trinity, and who were then still fairly numerous in the Orient.

The question naturally arises why Mahomet designated Christ as one sent by God and as his own precursor. The Middle Ages were quick to discover the solution of this problem : Mahomet was anxious to enlist the support of those unorthodox Christians who persisted in representing the Trinity as Father, Son and Mother, in strict accordance with the Egyptian prototypes of Osiris, Horus and Isis.

Of the thirty-seven miracles of Christ recorded in the Gospels, the Koran mentions only three, namely, the healing of the man who had been born blind, the healing of the leper and the resurrection from the dead. Four other miraculous events are, however, recorded by Mahomet : (1) It is related of Jesus that he was able to speak from the hour of His birth. (2) He is described as moulding a living bird from clay. (3) He caused a great table laden with food to descend from heaven. (4) Certain Jews who refused to accept His teaching He turned into swine.

The first " miracle," as it happens, has been recorded by various visionaries, both men and women. It seems to be bound up in the idea of that Divine insight which was Our Lord's when He was born into this world. The

second "miracle" is described as having taken place at Nazareth in the records of the Apocrypha dealing with incidents of the Divine Infancy. The fourth "miracle" appears to have originated in some misconception on the subject of the evil spirits and the swine recorded in Luke viii. 32.

The third "miracle" is so strongly reminiscent of the vision of St. Peter in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts xi. 5) that the narrative of the Prophet was probably influenced by the description of the incident given in the Bible, though his record, given in the fifth Sura of the Koran, is certainly on more elaborate lines:

Remember when the Apostles said: "O Jesus, Son of Maryam, is thy Lord able to send down to us a furnished table out of Heaven?"—He said: "Fear God, if ye be believers."—They said: "We desire to eat therefrom, and to have our hearts assured; and to know that thou hast indeed spoken truth to us."—Jesus, Son of Maryam, said: "O God, our Lord, send down to us a table out of heaven that it may be a sign from Thee; and do Thou nourish us, for Thou art the best of nourishers."—And God said: "Verily, I will cause it to descend unto you; but whoever among you after that shall disbelieve, I will surely chastise him with a chastisement, wherewith I will not chastise any other creature."

Those versed in the Koran expatiate with much gusto on this table and its miraculous fare. Amongst other delicacies was a baked fish endued with marvellous powers, which had five large loaves attached to its tail and olives, dates, vinegar and salt around its head. Thirteen hundred people are said to have partaken of this wonderful fish, and such as were sick were all healed of their infirmities.

The Koran also ascribes to Our Lord a number of miracles performed in Egypt, without, however, enumerating them in detail.

The Paraclete promised by Christ is identified by Mahomet in a sense with himself. He says:

And remember when Jesus, the Son of Mary, said: "O children of Israel, of a truth I am God's Apostle to you to confirm the Law and who is to announce unto you the coming of another Apostle named Achmed."

In this doctrine, Mahomet revives the ancient heresy of Montanus, the Phrygian priest of Cybele, who was

responsible for a similar assertion four hundred and sixty years before Mahomet's own day.

Mahomet denies Christ's Passion, declaring that Our Lord was never crucified, but was taken up into heaven without having suffered pain or death. All that is recorded on the subject of the Passion is pure invention and calumny (against the Jews?). He who was crucified between two thieves and who resembled Jesus in many ways was a certain Assiug. He had been Chief Rabbi and suffered death at Herod's orders and at the instigation of the Jewish priests on the 29th of the Coptic month of Barramhat (March) on a Friday at three in the afternoon. For seventy-two hours the earth was shrouded in darkness and was shaken in its very foundations.

It is interesting to note that the Chapel of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives erected by the Crusaders is in the hands of the Mohammedans. Only once a year, on the Christian Feast of the Ascension, they permit the Franciscans to utilize it for religious purposes, and then only between the hours of midnight and 10 a.m.

The above in a brief outline is Mahomet's teaching on the subject of Christ. That it is a very difficult matter to convert his adherents to Christianity is mainly due to this strange distorted portrayal of the Personality of Our Divine Lord.

"BAKERISM" AT DOUAY SEMINARY

BY THE REV. JUSTIN McCANN, O.S.B., M.A.

DOM LEANDER PRICHARD, in his account of Father Augustine Baker—written about the year 1650—gives a description of his life at St. Gregory's, Douay, after he had ceased to be chaplain at Cambray, that is, in the period 1633-1638. Fr. Prichard notes that on his first coming to live at Douay Fr. Baker was not much used as a spiritual adviser, but that after he had been there some time, his room became a favourite resort for all and sundry.

And those were not only the religious of the same monastery, but also the secular youths and convictores which lived with, and were bred up under the monks. Yea, there resorted to him divers from the English Seminary, both secular young men and priests; and one or two also from the monastery of the English Recollects. I will not say that these *parvuli*, or little ones, seeking thus for bread, had not those at home (I mean in their owne respective houses) who could break it unto them. But yet they giving all respect to their superiors and taking a Christian liberty (which the said superiors did not controule) to take their spirituall food where they could find it, did resort to him; who ministred to each of them food most proper and wholesome to them. And some of them, viz., some who came from the Seminary, were commended to him by those who had the care of their souls in the said Seminary.¹

For a few years, then, Fr. Baker lived thus at Douay, occupied with the composition of spiritual treatises and with the dispensing of spiritual advice to all who asked it from him. But presently (1638) this beneficent career was interrupted and the old man—he was then 63 and infirm—ordered by his superiors to return to England and the work of the Mission. We are not concerned here with the reasons for this apparently severe treatment, but mention it only to record another instance of Fr.

¹ From "*Quadrilogus, or a collection of four treatises concerning the life and writings of the venerable father Fa. Augustin Baker,*" a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Mazarine (No. 1755), fol. 116. It is hoped that the Catholic Record Society will publish a transcript of this valuable record.

Baker's connection with the English College at Douay. The command which had come to him caused something like consternation among his friends, and various attempts were made to prevent his departure. One of these efforts is thus described by Fr. Prichard :

Moreover, some of Fa. Baker's friends did advise him to make use and benefit of a courtesy or grace which the English Seminary and the President of it, Dr. Kellison,² had formerly bestowed on him, viz., an adoption to be a child or alumnus of their College, assuring him that he might now make his benefit of the said favour or honour, with the good will of the heads of the Seminary. But Fa. Baker would not do so, both for other reasons and especially for the shame that would fall upon the monastery of Doway, by such his entertainment in the Seminary. The President and Vice-President of the said Seminary, viz., Dr. Kellison and Dr. Stratford,³ two venerable and learned priests who wondred much at this proceeding against Fa. Baker, came to take their leaves of him. And the morning he went away there resorted from the Seminary to him a greater number then his cell could well entertain. Of which company Dr. Stratford being one, protested that he was very sorry that he had not, when he might have, entered into more familiar acquaintance with Fa. Baker, for the taking of spirituall instructions from him. For he said that his intention was to have received further instruction from him for matters of his soule; and that hitherto he had never read anie spirituall books (yet he had read many, being not only a learned, but a devout man) which gave him better satisfaction then what he had read of Fa. Bakers.⁴

After these glimpses of what we may call a " Bakerist " movement⁵ at the English College there falls a darkness

² Dr. Matthew Kellison, theologian and writer, a great President of the College (1613-1642).

³ Otherwise Dr. Edmund Lechmere (d. 1640), a distinguished theologian and controversialist.

⁴ *Quadrilogus*, ff. 132, 133. The same incidents are narrated also by Fr. Cressy (*ibid* f. 195).

⁵ Fr. Baker's spiritual teaching had its ardent disciples and its equally ardent critics, who were wont to call the disciples " Bakerists " and the teaching " Bakerism." Bakerism might be defined as a devout effort towards union with God by the way of love under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But, in the methods which it favoured, Bakerism represented a reaction against certain aspects of contemporary devotion, and so stimulated controversy. For instance, the Bakerist laid his chief stress upon prayer and communion with God, rather than upon the cultivation of virtues. He preferred affective prayer to

and silence until a date about fifteen years later, when Dr. George Leyburne (President, 1652-1670) had taken over the government of the College. The veil is lifted for us by an old manuscript book, entitled *An Apologie for Myself About Father Baker's Doctrine*, which is preserved in the library of Ampleforth Abbey (MS. 48). The book is in its old parchment binding, has 145 written pages (8 x 6 ins.) and contains about 44,000 words. It is written in that old style of writing—sometimes called court hand—which preceded our present italic, and might be dated, from the writing alone, to about the year 1650. If it is not its author's autograph manuscript, it must be a contemporary copy. It bears no author's name and no date, but internal evidence enables us to make plausible suggestions for both. Before doing so, however, let us give the author's opening paragraphs, so that the reader may have some idea of the book about which we are talking. This is the beginning of his First Chapter:

The Occasion of writinge this Apologie.

Sir,

You know something hath been objected against me about Fa. Bakers Books, as though all my endeavour were only or chiefly to bring the practise of them into the house, and as if I conceived that I could not in anything doe God soe good service as in doing that, whereas this doctrine notwithstanding hath been esteemed by some to be phantasticall, and dangerous, by others improper and unfitte for the Colledge.

At first I sleighted this objection, as not finding any who would owne it, as also in regard it is no new thing for good men through mistakes to goe contrary wayes; but since, I perceave things are come to a farre greater hight, insomuch as I who have lived heere so long, and without any such exceptions, am now conceived unfitt to remaine in the Colledge, and only because I am esteemed a promoter of this way, which is thought to be quite contrary to our state and *opposite to the vocation of Missioners*—wherefore I thinke it necessary that I should doe my endeavour, as well to cleere myself from this imputation, as in what I can to vindicate truth from the staine of error, and pietie from the esteeme of folly. (pp. 1, 2.)

The Apologist then proceeds to set forth the charges

formal meditation and was inclined to disparage the latter. Instead of the elaborate spiritual direction of the period, he relied upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit in his prayer. And there were other points of difference.

brought against him and his answers to them. But before following him in this argument let us seek to determine the date of the apology and its probable authorship; and first the date.

The apology is addressed to a President of the College by one of the officials, and is addressed to the President soon after his appointment, for the apologist appeals to him, as to a new arrival, to give his case a fair hearing (p. 99). It is quite certain that the President in question is Dr. George Leyburne (1652-1670), because the apologist mentions that he had been criticised already under the presidency of Dr. Hyde (1646-1651), whom he calls "the last President" (p. 92), and because he mentions Dr. Leyburne by name (p. 103). He prays that the practice of internal prayer may flourish in the College,

as after my poor fashion I expressed in the conclusion of my verses, which if they durst have spoken up would at your entertainment in the Refectory have said thus, videlicet :

Sic locus hic sanctus, sanctorum sanguine vernans
Florebit semper : sic dum Leyburne gubernas
Hic Paradisus erit : dum tu moderaris habenas,
Mystica devotae rutilabit semita vitae,
Aurea primaevi fulgebit gloria saeculi.

The entertainment mentioned in this passage is very probably the one given in honour of the new President on January 13th, 1653; and the terms in which the Apologist refers to it would seem to imply that he was writing not long after. A limiting date is perhaps supplied by the resolution of the English Benedictines taken in August, 1653, to publish a compendium of Fr. Baker's teaching; for the Apologist knows nothing of this, and even proposes himself to make such a compendium. But a more secure basis for a date before the late summer of 1653 is supplied when the Apologist tells us that he had been criticised under Dr. Hyde and defended by "Mr. Clayton, then Reader of Divinity heare, shortly after made Doctor, as his learning worthily deserved, and since president of our English Colledge at Lisbo" (p. 92). This "Mr. Clayton" was President of Lisbon from July 11th, 1651, until his death on September 19th, 1653. So that the *Apologie* must have been written not later than the latter date.

The same reference to Mr. Clayton (whose real name was Humphrey Whitaker) gives a date for an earlier

stage of the controversy, for Mr. Clayton taught at Douay for little more than a year (November 16th, 1647, to January 29th, 1649), so that the incident of the letter may be ascribed roughly to the year 1648. The Apologist several times refers to his chief adversary as a doctor of divinity, of great influence among the English clergy, and author of a book of meditations “ for the use of a Colledge of Missioners as ours is,” from which he quotes some passages. The doctor in question is certainly Dr. Edward Daniel (*vere* Pickford), who was President of Lisbon for six years (1642-1648), and afterwards professor of theology and Vice-President at Douay (June 19th, 1650-July 4th, 1653.⁶ The Apologist speaks of his opposition both by letter and by personal influence. Perhaps it was especially strong during the period between Dr. Hyde’s death and Dr. Leyburne’s arrival, when Dr. Daniel ruled the College, *i.e.*, in the year 1652, so that the Apologist felt driven to state his case for the new President. However that may be, we are justified in saying that the internal evidence indicates a controversy which spread over the years 1648-1653, and in suggesting the spring or early summer of 1653 as a likely date for the composition of the *Apologie*.

The Apologist was, as we have already said, an official of the College. Further than that, he is in charge of the consciences of at least some of the students, for he is accused of giving them unsuitable, if not bad, direction. He refers several times to his relations with the “schollers.” He protests that he has lent Fr. Baker’s books to very few of them. He tells us that it was his duty to discover a simple method of meditation “for the helpe of some of the yonger sorte in the Colledge, whom by the Rules I was somewaies or other to putt into the spirituall exercise” (p.71). He discusses “whether this way be fitt for such collegians as intend not to be priests and missioners” (p. 51). He believes that a simple affective prayer, as taught by Fr. Baker, is easier than meditation

for the most of the students of the Colledge, especially for youths and yonger boyes who at least are under poetry,

⁶ The title of his book is: *Meditations collected and ordered for the use of the English College at Lisboe. By the Superiours of the same Colledge.* 1649.

and yet having privat chambers are bound according to the Rule and custome of the Colledge to come into the church in meditation time, and there to meditate: which some of them perhaps are as fitt for performing after the ordinary fashion as to runne their heads against the wall. (p. 80.)

He had been at the College "for these 4 or 5 yeares" (pp. 3 and 118); but he was there at an earlier period also, for he records these personal reminiscences of Dr. Stratford (Lechmere), for many years professor in the College, who died about the year 1640. Dr. Stratford had been prejudiced against Fr. Baker's teaching, thinking it strange and insecure, until the Apologist showed him some of Fr. Baker's devotional exercises. Then Dr. Stratford,

smiling or laughing at his owne mystake and conceit said unto me of that booke and way thus, *This is fitt for J.J.* Now this J.J was at that time a servant in the Colledge who had a great desire to be a priest, but was thought altogether unfitt, yea uncapable, as being of a very slow and dull apprehension, and no waies fitt for learning, yet a good honest devout man. (p. 97.)⁷

The Apologist even has hopes of converting his adversary and turning him into a devout Bakerist, for he claims to have so converted Dr. Stratford.

It pleased God to make me an instrument somewaies at least and in part to conduce towards convincing another Doctour in the very same businesse, and that soe far furth as speaking once unto me, he brake out into these pathetically words, "I pray God make me a good scholler of this way." Since, I say, this then happened unto me, I hope through the divine grace I shall be also able in time to satisfy you, especially consideringe that other was noe lesse man then Doctour Stratford, heretofore both your Master and mine, who while he lived was truly a bright shining lampe of our English Clergy for his eminency both in learning and vertue. (p. 100.)

So the Apologist was a student at the English College at least as far back as 1640. His references to personal contacts with Fr. Baker himself, who left Douay in 1638, would take him back further still. He claims to have known Fr. Baker personally "many yeares agoe," and several times quotes words that he had heard from his

⁷ Perhaps John Jackson, the cook, who retires after long and faithful service in May, 1647. *Fourth Douay Diary*. C.R.S. XI. p. 467.

own lips (pp. 44, 63, 106, 107, 124). He had visited Fr. Baker in his cell and can describe the "great paper crucifix which was alwaies before his eyes as he satte in his chamber" and the Latin verses under it:

Sola salus servire Deo, sunt cetera vana.

Omne quod est nihil est, praeter amare Deum. (p. 130.)

What official, then, of the College, who in the spring of 1653 had been there "4 or 5 years," satisfies all these conditions? An examination of the personnel as recorded in the *Fifth Douay Diary* shows that there is one, and only one, candidate for the authorship, viz., the Rev. Francis Gascoigne, who in March, 1653, had been back at the College for four years and nine months, who had held during that period the posts of Confessor and of General Prefect, and whose personal and family history fit admirably the needs of our case. Here is a short account of his life.

Francis Gascoigne was born December 10th, 1605, the fourth son of Sir John Gascoigne, of Barnbow Hall, Yorkshire. He was sent to school in Douay, where he completed a course of humanities and philosophy with the English Benedictines. He was admitted to the English College, to commence his theology, on October 11th, 1630, and took the College oath on February 27th, 1635. He then went on the English Mission, and seems to have worked in his native Yorkshire, at Linton-upon-Ouse, ten miles to the north-west of York. During the troubles of the Civil War he retired to the continent and began to reside again at the English College on June 30th, 1648. On July 27th he was appointed General Prefect of the College, an office which he held intermittently for the next five years. On August 29th of the same year he became one of the Confessors, and was still in that post five years later, on October 1st, 1653. The *Fifth Douay Diary* breaks off early in 1654, and we have no precise information about his departure from the College. But he seems to have left Douay about that time, and after a stay in Paris to have returned to Linton, where he lived until his death in 1676.⁸ He had two brothers and two sisters in the English Benedictine Congregation: one of the brothers being John Placid Gas-

⁸ These details are taken chiefly from Joseph Gillow's prefatory note to the registers of Linton (C.R.S., XVII, p. 424).

coigne, Abbot of Lamspring, and one of the sisters, Catherine, the Abbess of Cambray. The other Benedictine sister, Margaret, died young in 1637 and left behind her some devotional papers which were put into order and prefaced with an account of her life by Fr. Baker himself. Abbess Gascoigne was a staunch disciple who suffered a good deal for her loyalty; Abbot Placid was the prime mover in the publication of *Sancta Sophia*. The family had, in fact, a special devotion to Fr. Baker's teaching, and Francis Gascoigne, as a member of that family, would have been specially acceptable to Fr. Baker. He could have known Fr. Baker personally both at Cambray—where his sister was abbess—and at Douay. Some of the extant MSS. of Fr. Baker's treatises were once his property. It is probable that he was the editor of "The Holy Practices of a Devine Lover" (Paris, 1657), a collection of Fr. Baker's devotional exercises, as he certainly was of the "Spiritual Exercises" of Dame Gertrude More (Paris, 1658), a thoroughly Baker book. We conclude that Francis Gascoigne was the author of the *Apologie* and that he wrote it in the spring of 1653.

Let us now set out as briefly as possible the course of his argument. In his third chapter he gives a list of the points with which he proposes to deal in the *Apologie*, and these are as follows :

First it may be asked : Whether there be att all such a way that is truly reall and good ; or els that it is but a mere Foppery as once a certaine Rabbi seemed to tearme it, or Phantasticall as others have apprehended? 2° Whether this way differ from the Ordinary and what it is? 3° Whether it be better then it? 4° Whether it be not too obscure and difficult? 5° Whether it be of sufficient authoritie to be followed? 6° Whether it be truly fitt for the Colledge? 7° Whether Fa. Bakers books be fit to be used in the Colledge, or no? (p. 5.)

Passing over his replies to the first five questions (pp. 5-19), let us go straight to the sixth, which is, as he says, "the maine cardo of the businesse." The critics urged that Fr. Baker's teaching was designed for persons leading an abstracted and contemplative life and was therefore quite unsuited to a "collegial life and missionary course." Mr. Gascoigne will not admit this. He deprecates talk about contemplation as though it were some state of "bare speculation in mirabilibus super se";

whereas "true mystike contemplation, as also the way towards it, doth mainly and principally consist in the exercise of Holy Love," and "nothing is more low and humble, nothing more plaine and simple than the downright way of love." And he will not hear of "this way of an internall life" being closed to the missionary priest.

For shall we, who by oath and profession have obliged ourselves to that great work which is *Opus Divinorum Divinissimum* (the conversion of soules to God) and yet reject a medium so necessarie for the performance thereof as is the doctrine or way of contemplation, the science of Mystike Theologie or Divine Wisdome, which is nothing els then the art of Heavenly Love? Shall we sweare and undertake to expose our bodies to the cruell tortures of our barbarous enemies for the love of our neighbour, and yet refuse to have in our soules the doctrine and practise of that happy way which alone can bring us to the perfect love of God? This would be too preposterous a proceeding for such as be professors of pietie and from the bottom of their heart sincerely seeke their owne true good. Shall we who take ourselves to be the prime of the Apostolicall Mission, equalling yea preferring our condition before theirs who publickly professe the wayes of perfection, ourselves refuse to walke therein? Oh no; for that were not the way to comply with our vocation. Or finally shall we who take upon us to be the guides of soules through the unknown wayes of a spirituall life, ourselves be willfully ignorant therein by neglecting and rejecting a knowledge which so properly belongs unto us? Oh surely no; for so we may come to be among the number of those Blind who leading the blind both fell into the ditch: or else of those who say unto God, *Scientiam viarum tuarum nolumus* (Job xxi. 14). (p. 21.)

He presses this argument vigorously, and then adduces "authorities" in support of his thesis, bringing forward (among others) St. Gregory the Great, St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure (pp. 23-44). As an *argumentum ad hominem*—for his chief adversary was a prominent member of the clergy—he next adduces the authority of the "Superiours of our English Mission." He points out that by the statutes of the English Chapter the canons were required to devote two half-hours a day to "divine contemplations." "If our superiors set this ideal before themselves, then we seminarists ought to prepare

⁹ *Quotquot sumus Canonici praesenti decreto astringimur . . . bis in die contemplationibus divinis semihoram insumere.*

ourselves so that we may be able to imitate them when we become missionaries (p. 45). The next section of his argument is a closer *argumentum ad hominem*, for he confutes Dr. Daniel out of his own mouth. In his book of meditations for the College at Lisbon, Dr. Daniel had put a very high ideal before the collegians and had said such things as that the true missionary should be the "head and master of contemplatives," and that he was not to fear that "preaching or teaching doth any way hinder the contemplative part." And he had even spoken of the *via negativa* and embodied in his text the teaching of Denis the Areopagite. How are we to account for this inconsistency? There is only one satisfactory theory, says Mr. Gascoigne, viz., that Dr. Daniel is a spoilt mystic.

One thing I know that they who have once entred into this way, this happy way of an internall lyfe, if afterwards they neglect to practise it, they will in time also be apte to lose the knowledge of it, yea and more even to dislike and oppose what formerly they loved and honoured, their inward taste being now through some secret maladie corrupted and changed, God so permitting for neglect of His grace. (pp. 50, 51.)

Addressing himself next to the question "whether this way be fitt for such collegians as intend not to be priests and missionaries" he first lays it down that the way of perfection is no preserve of ecclesiastics, but open to all Christians without distinction. Witness the numerous saints and martyrs from the ranks of the laity. And Douay too had produced its lay martyrs. He then appeals to authority in the persons of Blossius, St. Francis of Sales and Bartholomew of the Martyrs, all of whom admit laymen to the highest stages of the spiritual life. And finally, he appeals to reason :

What other thinge is mystike theologie or the practise of it but that which is signified by one principall and authentike definition thereof, to wit: *Extensio animi ad Deum per amoris desiderium*? And in a Colledge, or Seminarie of Martyrs wherein are grafted so many branches of worthy families that by good education they may grow and flourish in vertues, shall we quite exclude them all from being capable or fitte for that noble exercise of lovinge and longinge after their God, their highest good? No, God forbid. (p. 56.)¹⁰

¹⁰ In another place when speaking of Mr. Clayton, then President of the Lisbon College and formerly (1640-1647) a

But Mr. Gascoigne, though he objects to the criticisms levelled against Bakerism and himself, and repudiates them vigorously, is not by any means an extremist. On the contrary, he has every wish to be conciliatory and to achieve some measure of agreement with his adversary. So he is ready to grant, in the first place, that though the mystic way retains its pre-eminence and its rights, yet in practice only the few are really fit to walk in it. He agrees that only very few in the College are fit for contemplation.

And this seems agreeable to what I remember long since Fa. Baker said unto me, viz., that it was well or much if there were found 3 or 4 in a Colledge or Monastery fitte for this waye.

But lest we should think that he is thus giving away his case and practically yielding to his adversary, he hastens to make a very important distinction. The majority of the Collegians may well, as he has admitted, be unfit for the "higher degrees" of this way; but they cannot be unfit for its lower degrees. Indeed they may be more fit for these lower degrees of the mystic way, than they are for the "ordinary way," and so might very well be put into them. What does he mean by the "ordinary way," and what by the "lower degrees" of the mystic way? Both ways require the mortification of our passions and the cultivation of virtues; in both we have to "avoid whatever is displeasing to God, and performe those things which are truly agreeable to his will." But this moral effort is not the whole of religion; there is a greater thing still, namely prayer. And it is in prayer that the great distinction lies. For whereas in the "ordinary way" we use discursive prayer, that is to say formal meditation with its elaborate "preparations and praeludiums, prologues and preambles" and its intricate development, in the other we use affective prayer, a very

professor there, he says: "Yea just now as I am writing this, it comes to my mind, and I remember it well, he told me how they had the practise of the very same way in that Colledge. And why then I pray may not we have it in this? especially it being nothing els then the true and right practise of solid vertue soe as shall be agreeable to everyones condition. Moreover he said that they who followed it there were most vertuous and angelicall youths: and shall we be afraid that ours heere be such?" (p. 92.)

much simpler thing. Indeed this affective prayer is so simple in its essence that most men, and certainly most women, would make much more of it than of formal meditation. For what is affective prayer? It consists merely of "pious affections or acts of the will, produced either out of a natural disposition to piety and devotion, or else forced by the help of some brief motive reason or little discourse." It permits of much variety of method, which makes it all the easier. It may be purely mental, or both mental and vocal. A man may use a book or not, as he finds suitable for his case. But whatever he does, he must not waste his time in excursions of the intellect or the imagination. Let him get quickly to affection, for that is the heart of prayer. The exercise of the will and affections is "the very life and soule of prayer." Now surely this simple, affective prayer is suitable for the Collegians, nay more suitable for them than elaborate meditation. And Fr. Baker, for the sake of beginners in the mystic way, gave careful teaching about affective prayer and provided a body of exercises which could be used in it. These he called *The Ideots Devotions*, to signify that they were intended for the plain man.

Mr. Gascoigne proceeds to give three exercises from the first book of these Devotions, with some explanation of the manner in which they are to be used. How simple and easy are these prayers! Who could not use them with profit? And yet my critics say that Fr. Baker's teaching is unsuitable for the College and contrary to the vocation of missionaries. On this note does he end his answer to the sixth question, proclaiming the value and suitability for the College, not of all Fr. Baker's teaching, but of his instructions for beginners in the mystic way.

Very similar is his answer to the seventh and final question: "Whether Fa. Bakers books be fit to be used in the Colledge, or no?" Some of his treatises are unfit for the College, either because of the manner in which they are written or because of their subject matter; others are quite fit for the College and would do much good there. Of these latter he gives a select list of a half-dozen, apart from the books of devotional exercises. And that is his final conclusion and a reasonable compromise to which he expects his adversary to agree.

In a word the summe and substance of all or most I either have said, or can say, about these two last points of

Fa. Bakers doctrine and his Books and who they are fitt for it is this: I devide as well his doctrine as his Books severally into two parts or kinds, whereof the one I affirm to be good and fitt for many (that is supposing they will but comply with Gods grace to make themselves fitt for it) the other though the doctrine be good yet as well it as the books are unfitte and unproper for many. Or els I say thus: One part of Fa. Bakers doctrine and books is more fitt and proper for some sorts of persons and another part for others. . . . Wherefore to conclude my answer to the 7th and last question, I must needs affirme that taking all Fa. Bakers work together, I know not whether any one writer hath treated of mystike or more spirituall matters so particularly and largely, so plainly and practically for the use of beginners, yea even of the meaneest capacities, as he hath done, especially considering that he so little regarded any curiosity or exactnesse of method. But neither can all his works be gotten, nor could Collegians ordinarily have time enough to read them, nor yet (as I have said and say againe) are they all fitt for everyone, neither did Fa. Baker himselfe think so, but directly and expressly the contrary. Yea doubtlesse it were foolish and absurd promiscuously to communicate either his or other such like books equally to all, or indeed without good circumspection and warinesse; and in this we truly agree with our adversaries, hoping they will take it kindly that we shake hands with them therein. (p. 98.)

On this reasonable note we may take leave of Mr. Gascoigne's *Apologie*. We do not know what was the result of his book, or even if it was ever submitted to the President. At any rate he survived his chief "adversary," for Dr. Daniel left Douay in July of 1653, while Mr. Gascoigne is still there, and in office, in the October of that year. But he does not seem to have remained there much longer. From a record of March 3rd, 1655,¹¹ he appears to be residing then in Paris, and it is possible that he was there in 1657 and 1658, for the publication of the two books to which we have already referred. After that, doubtless, he returned to his missionary work in England, to die in 1676.

In conclusion let us say this: The *Apologie* is interesting for the light which it throws upon the English College of Douay in an obscure period of its history and also for its general subject; but it seems to us that the Apologist is particularly happy and sensible in the main lines of his defence. Though he is a convinced "Bakerist" and

¹¹ In the Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS. A. 36 p. 62.

agrees with Dr. Stratford that Fr. Baker "had in him the spirit of God in a high degree" (p. 140), yet he is no extremist. The distinction which he makes of degrees in Fr. Baker's teaching and books is a sound one. Fr. Baker himself wrote for beginners and also for the more advanced, and he would not have wished these different doctrines to be confused. Yet perhaps that is what has often happened to him, and perhaps it is in this confusion that we should find the explanation of the misunderstandings and controversies which have attended his teaching. Perhaps even *Sancta Sophia* itself has contributed to the misunderstanding. That book is a marvellous digest and compendium of his teaching, embracing the whole body of it within its compass. But the simplicity of his instructions for beginners is there obscured by the dazzle of his mystical doctrine. Too many readers retire daunted from a book which treats of "Passive Unions" and the "Great Desolation"; they never discover its simple doctrine of affective prayer.

Mr. Gascoigne, at the end of his *Apologie*, tells us that he has thoughts of making "some compendium or summary" of Fr. Baker's way. It is quite possible that he persevered in his intention and that the Paris book of 1657, *The Holy Practises of a Devine Lover*, was the result. It is only a small book, but so far as it goes it is a fair exposition of the simpler side of Fr. Baker's teaching. It is, in fact, nothing but an elementary manual of affective prayer. But prayer was the burden of all Fr. Baker's teaching, and affective prayer his prayer of predilection.

THE CATHOLIC CONFERENCE OF HIGHER STUDIES

BY THE REV. HUGH POPE, O.P., D.S.S.

PROBABLY most priests in England have heard something of this annual meeting, but few would like to have to explain what it really is. Perhaps this is due to the title of the Conference. We can imagine someone ejaculating "Higher Studies! Pray, what are Higher Studies?" It may comfort such cavillers to know that no question has been more frequently put by the members of the Conference at their meetings. They put other questions too. They ask "Why not 'Ecclesiastical Studies'?" or "Why not 'A Conference on Clerical Studies'?"

The truth is that it is exceedingly difficult to frame a title which shall exactly express what the Conference aims at being. If the reader wishes for a little amusement let him get hold of some member of the Conference, by preference one who has attended the meetings pretty regularly, and let him put those questions to him. I can warrant him a most interesting hour. It would not be etiquette, but how one would like to mention names of people likely to afford the most sport!

But there is another truth. This Conference has, despite its somewhat casual origin, come to stay. Let me sketch the history of the movement. For it is a movement, and it seems to be moving. The problem is whether it is moving in the right direction. In 1919 three enthusiasts met at Oxford; their names deserve to be had in remembrance. They were Fr. Lattey, S.J., the lamented Fr. Bernard O'Dowd, then in charge of St. Charles' at Oxford, a house for ecclesiastical students of the Birmingham diocese, and Fr. Anselm Parker, O.S.B., then in charge of St. Benet's Hall, Oxford. These three "madmen," as some unkind people thought them, put their sapient heads together and asked themselves whether it was not the case that, owing to a variety of circumstances, the various Ecclesiastical teaching-centres in England, the Seminaries and the houses where

the various Religious Orders taught their juniors, were in a state of hitherto unavoidable isolation and whether it would not be possible to change such an unfortunate state of affairs.

Like Topsy, all such institutions here in England have "grewed." They came into being as units when the opportunity offered. Co-ordination had to be a thing of the future. Could such co-ordination now be secured? The courageous originators of the scheme suggested that possibly a number of Professors might meet and exchange views.

To many it seemed a crazy scheme. Who would come? Where could they meet? What would it cost? etc., etc. However, letters of invitation went out from the enthusiasts, and I fancy they were astonished at the reception their suggestion met with. For thirty-one people turned up at this first historic meeting, among them Dr. Doubleday, then President of St. John's Seminary, Womersley, and shortly to be Bishop of the newly-formed Diocese of Brentwood, Essex.

That first meeting was a curious one. I think we were all somewhat shy of one another. We had a series of pedagogic papers: "How Do You Teach Dogma?" "How Should We Teach Church-history?" etc. Sometimes there was a chorus: "Oh! Do you do that? We don't!" For after each paper there was a long discussion, in the course of which some very plain ventilation of views was indulged in. But certainly the meeting had justified itself. We had all learned a lot, if only an increased respect for one another. So it was decided to repeat the experiment. The next year we met at Cambridge during Christmas week. Dr. Doubleday, who had proved a tower of strength in the previous year, had just been consecrated, but he agreed to come to this meeting, and his prudence helped to steer us through certain difficulties. For many questions came up for discussion, amongst others that of a Review. Probably no "movement" has survived a year without some bright mind urging that it ought to have a Review for the ventilation and propagation of its notions. The question was discussed at this meeting at considerable length and with a good deal of warmth, but the majority were against it. The idea has since been realised, though not by the Study Conference.

We said the discussion was a "warm" one. When asked how the Conference has lasted so long I sometimes feel tempted to reply that it is because we all say exactly what we think. Of course, we are always most polite; but we differ, and we say so plainly. At this second meeting it was decided to have a Committee of five who were to hold office for three years. Here again we were in somewhat of a quandary, for we were a gathering of Seculars and Regulars, and it would not be diplomatic to allow affairs to get into the hands of either body. Ultimately five were chosen by ballot: Dr. Hyland of Womersley, Fr. Williams of St. Charles', Oxford, and subsequently Archbishop of Birmingham—the third member of the Conference to be elevated to the Episcopate, Fr. Lattey, S.J., who has done more than any other to forward the movement, Fr. Corbishley from Ushaw, and lastly the unworthy writer of these pages.

The third meeting was held at Stonyhurst, 1921, and apart from the papers read—and torn to shreds, metaphorically speaking—some very important points came up for discussion. First of all Fr. Lattey proposed the inauguration of a Summer School which should deal with religious subjects of interest to the general Catholic public. This, after a tremendous discussion, was carried, though no one quite knew what the Summer School was to be for, nor who would come to it. Perhaps nobody! Still, the Conference started on an act of faith and has had to lean on that staff many a time since. The next subject discussed has proved to be a "hardy annual": "Who are we? What are we for? Why do we meet? Why does anybody come? Who cares what we say? What standing have we got? Is it not the case that we are rapidly degenerating into a pack of amiable old buffers who discuss the dullest of subjects in which no one outside ourselves has any real interest? Why call it 'Higher' studies?" These and similar remarks or questions were bandied about on a never-to-be-forgotten evening at Stonyhurst. And so far no one has ever yet succeeded in finding an answer to these conundrums! Perhaps that explains why the Conference has been able to exist so long!

We have purposely dwelt upon this aspect of the Conference, namely, the discussions which have taken place at the General Meetings, because they show that the

members are fully alive to certain incongruities in their position and also feel that the Conference is something worth fighting for. Of this there can be no doubt. The Papers read are, of course, interesting and touch for the most part on subjects of value to all who are teaching or have taught in Seminaries and Religious Houses. But it is not so much the Papers as the discussions which follow, whether in public or in private, that exercise the most far-reaching influence. The clash of ideas is good for all of us; it is a preservative against fossilisation and serves as a stimulus. Many a Professor of long experience in the teaching world has longed for an opportunity for full and free discussion of many points, whether as regards the curriculum or the methods of teaching, and he has found in this annual meeting a real outlet for ideas which otherwise might never have seen the light. The late lamented Mgr. Parkinson expressed this feeling very strongly when the Conference met at Oscott shortly before his death.

To return for a moment to the meeting at Stonyhurst. Another question came up in that protracted sitting: "Who has a right to attend the Conference? Is it only for people who are actually engaged in teaching?" It was unanimously agreed that all should be free to come, all, that is, who have any interest in ecclesiastical studies in England. Apropos of the Summer School, it was agreed that the subject dealt with should be the Holy Eucharist.

The fourth meeting was at Wonersh in 1922; twenty-five were present. Dr. Miller was elected on the Committee in place of Dr. Hyland, who had felt bound to resign for reasons of health. This was a peaceful meeting; at any rate I can find no traces of acrimonious discussions in the minutes. Perhaps the Secretary exercised a wise discretion!

The fifth meeting was at Oscott in 1923. This meeting inaugurated a new departure. Hitherto it had been the Secretary's thankless task to wring from reluctant people a promise of a Paper on "Something or other." Though the results had not proved unsatisfactory, the subjects were—to put it mildly—disconnected. Thus one year we had Papers on *Our Attitude Towards Social Reform*, on *A Comparative Study of Philosophic Methods*, on

Scandals in Church History—a Paper which succeeded in scandalising at least one Professor from one of the centres of learning!—another on *Psycho-analysis*, and we ended up with one on the *Stars*! But this year Archbishop Keating suggested that we should have a discussion on *The Diocesan Schools as a Preparation for the Seminary*. This suggested the idea of a kindred Paper on *The Relation of the Catholic Schools in General to the Universities* and another on *The Co-ordination of Seminary Studies*. This last was read by Dr. Downey, soon to be Archbishop of Liverpool, while one on *Humanities as a Preparation for Clerical Studies* was read by Dr. Williams, afterwards to be Archbishop of Birmingham. So successful was this notion of having two or three connected Papers that it has become a tradition in the Conference. You see, we are old enough to be able to speak of our “traditions”! Once more the Conference asked “Why do we exist? Why have we got such an egregious title?” And once more echo answered “Why?”

In 1924 we met at Cambridge again, and amongst those who read Papers were the late Canon Burton, who gave a fascinating Paper on *The Westminster Archives*, also Mr. Bullough and Fr. John O'Connor. Canon Burton's Paper had such an effect on the Conference that it had the audacity to frame the following resolution: “The Conference resolved to invite the attention of the Hierarchy and Religious Superiors to the desirability of devising measures for the co-ordination of historical information by investigating, cataloguing, and, if possible, indexing documents of Catholic interest existing in the various archives belonging to dioceses, Colleges, Religious Houses, etc., and thus making them available for purposes of historical research.” Presumably this resolution reached its destination.

1925 saw us at St. Beuno's where Dr. Phillips, for long a Professor at Oscott, read an inspiring paper on *Co-ordination in Ecclesiastical Education*. This time the old “hare” once more ran her course: “Who are we? Why have we got such a funny title?” etc. But a graver question was shortly to arise. The Summer School—a bairn of which the Conference had a right to be proud—was developing into a lusty child, and it was not easy to see what attitude the Conference was to adopt towards it. The permanent home of the Summer School was now

Cambridge, where alone we could find accommodation during the summer holidays. But this meant that the clergy at Cambridge became its sponsors, and the whole matter rightly fell under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Northampton.

The Capuchin Fathers at Olton had offered hospitality to the Conference of 1926, but an outbreak of fire there made it impossible. The Bishop of Northampton, however, convened a meeting at the Queen's Hotel, Birmingham, for full discussion of the relations to be established between the Conference and the Summer School. It was agreed that the Conference ought to discuss the subject to be treated of at the Summer School, that they should choose three subjects from which the Bishop should select one, that the Committee of the Conference should then draw up a programme and a list of lecturers, and that the clergy at Cambridge should, since they were more intimately concerned with the School, discuss that programme and the proposed lecturers with the Conference Committee.

1927 saw the Conference at Olton. But the weather was so bad that very few turned up. The minute book preserves a discreet silence as to the actual number! The prospects for the future of the Conference looked so gloomy that it seemed as though we had assembled for the last time. In fact we met in sadness and gloom to vote ourselves out of existence! Yet in some indefinable way things began, as we gathered round the table, to look less gloomy—it was not an after-dinner meeting! We discussed matters very fully, and it was suggested that perhaps we should do better if we changed the venue from Christmas to Easter. It was agreed to give this a trial, and also to circularise the clergy on the subject of the Conference. For the first time an annual subscription of half-a-crown was imposed. Things must have looked very black indeed!

The 1929 Conference, which met at St. Edmund's House, Cambridge, during Easter week, was an unqualified success. Indeed, the Conference may be said to have taken a new lease of life this year. The numbers who made the journey to Cambridge were equal to those of any former Conference, and they were increased by the presence of the Cambridge clergy and of Mr. Edward

Bullough, M.A. and Fellow of Gonville and Caius College. His Lordship the Bishop of Northampton was also present and gave the Conference a most encouraging *nihil obstat*. The papers were all of a high standard and of great practical value, and their scope was as varied as ever. The Conference had the pleasure of welcoming Dr. W. J. O'Donovan, one of a number of medical men whose presence at these meetings has been most welcome and valuable.

During Easter week, 1930, some weeks before the formal opening of the new Chapel and Seminary, the Conference held its meeting at St. Joseph's College, Upholland. Apologetics formed the main subject of the papers and discussions, the inaugural address being given by His Grace Archbishop Downey, from the first a staunch friend and supporter of the Conference.

Last Easter the Conference held its meeting at Heythrop College, the Jesuit House of Studies in Oxfordshire. No more appropriate centre for the Conference could be imagined, in spite of the somewhat complicated journey that was entailed. His Grace Archbishop Williams opened the Conference with an inaugural address in which, after expressing his pleasure at the continued *bene esse* of the Conference, he read a most interesting paper on suggested reforms in the Catechism of Christian Doctrine. Three papers on various aspects of Psychology were read and discussed, and a practical demonstration given of the mysteries of the Heythrop Phonic Chronoscope. A kind invitation was given to the Conference by Monsignor Newcome to visit Besford Court, which was accepted by the majority of the members, who were royally entertained by the genial prelate.

Looking back on this series of meetings one can only feel thankful for them. And we are sure that this will be echoed by all who have attended. If we have learned nothing else, we have at least learned to know one another and that is something to be grateful for. But we have learned something else. We have learned how keen is the desire for improvement in clerical studies and how hard the clergy everywhere are working to secure that improvement. It is this that makes the Conference so well worth while.

THE HUMAN APPEARANCE OF CHRIST

BY THE REV. BERNARD LEEMING, S.J.

THE bizarre theory of Eisler, so much discussed recently, may perhaps justify some fuller treatment of the human aspect of our Saviour. In the first thousand years after His death there were at least four hundred and fifty different representations of Him made by artists: are they all merely the fanciful creations of artists' dreams, or do any of them pretend to real portraiture? Does tradition, either in literature or in art, afford us with any fair approximation to safety a general type of countenance which was actually our Lord's?

A vigorous affirmative answer was given by Sir Wyke Bayliss in his charming and delightful book *Rex Regum*, published in 1898, holding strongly that there is a traditional "likeness" of our Lord which represents Him, at least in broad feature, exactly as He actually appeared when on this earth in life. A certain fresco in the catacombs, beautifully copied by the distinguished artist Thomas Heapy and reproduced in Sir Wyke's book, is claimed to be both typical of the "likeness" which all later artists accepted as the basis of their work, and the earliest appearance of the "likeness." In it Sir Wyke finds that definite type of countenance which, varied indeed by different expressions given by different artists, still has held sway in all Christian pictures of Christ: "the fair broad forehead, the arched eyebrows, the straight nose, the kind yet serious mouth, the falling of the hair upon the shoulders, the parting of the beard," all this, says Sir Wyke Bayliss, is the traditional and the true likeness of Christ. This same fresco is thus described by the artist Kleugner: "The face is oval, with a straight nose, arched eyebrows, a smooth and rather high forehead, the expression serious and mild; the hair, parted on the forehead, flows in long curls down the shoulders; the beard is not thick, but short and divided; the age between thirty and forty."

"There is a general opinion," R. St. John Tyrwitt says of this fresco, "that it may have been of as early date as the second century; and what we know of it may well induce us to believe that it was the original of that ideal

of our Lord's countenance which has passed, through Leonardo da Vinci, into all Christian painting." Sir Wyke Bayliss declares that the features of the fresco are the same as those in nearly all representations of Christ—those on engraved vessels of glass, the mosaics, metal ornaments and cloth pictures. He concludes that some one who had known Christ in Palestine came to Rome and painted this picture in the catacombs, the presence there of Peter and Paul guaranteeing its correctness, "it is inconceivable that they would have sanctioned the perpetuation of any likeness of Him, knowing it to be false."

Unhappily, Sir Wyke Bayliss was more of an art critic than a scholar; he writes with the high enthusiasm and the charm of a poet, and one regrets that more prosaic authorities such as Wilpert, Calmet, Martigny, Northcote and Brownlow, Leclercq, to mention but a few, agree that we have no authentic representation of Christ. The fresco referred to actually was in the catacombs of Domatilla, though Sir Wyke Bayliss, with several others, assigns it to the catacombs of Callixtus. Moreover, it does not appear to have been photographed until the deadly effects of damp and smoke had almost obliterated its distinctive features; the copies made by hand are of dubious exactitude, and those shown by Kleugner, Heapy, Bosio and Avanzini differ very considerably one from the other. Further, the dating is, to say the least, uncertain; and Tyrwhitt's assertion of agreement on the second century is contradicted by Wilpert, who assigns it certainly to the second half of the fourth century, and by de Rossi, Lindsay, Northcote and Brownlow, who assign it dubiously to the third. Thus the most competent archæologists would account it as having been painted at least one hundred and sixty years or so after our Saviour's death. Apart, however, from the question of the date of this particular painting, there are two main reasons why the authorities generally agree that we have no authentic portrait of Christ: first, the pictures in the catacombs; and second, the written tradition in the matter.

It will scarcely be denied that Wilhelm Wilpert's monumental work on the pictures in the catacombs is the greatest authority. Wilpert was a fellow-worker with de Rossi, was asked by the Pontifical Commission on Excavation to continue de Rossi's work, and in 1903,

after more than fifty years of intense labour and study, produced *Le Pitture delle Catacombe Romane*. The book reproduces over 280 pictures of Christ taken from the walls of the catacombs, and its author, after discussing them, concludes as follows: "Looking at the representations of Christ in the catacombs, we find that we cannot speak of a fixed type; not even the figures which are painted in the same room and by the same hand present the same resemblance. What St. Augustine says of the representations of Christ in his day: *Nam et ipsius Domini facies carnis innumerabilium cogitationum variatur et fingitur, quae tamen una erat quaecumque erat*, can be applied to the pictures in the catacombs. The artists only agree in this, that they represent Him as beardless when He works miracles, and from the third century onward they usually give Him abundant hair. The expression of the face varies in the beginning between that of a youth and that of a man; later it becomes boyish. This incertitude in the appearance of the head of Christ sufficiently demonstrates that the painters of the catacombs did not in fact possess a portrait of Christ."¹

Wilpert points out also that there was a certain evolution in the type of painting: the earlier pictures are always beardless, and the reason for this is interesting. In the first and second centuries in Rome it was the fashion to shave; to wear a beard had as definite a significance as to wear a uniform. A beard was the sign of mourning, or of the profession of "philosophy." Neither became Christ, and the actual fact that Christ wore a beard according to the Jewish custom did not outweigh the Christian desire to dissociate Him both from the quack profession of "philosophy," and from the mourning and grief which He came to destroy by His resurrection. Especially in the catacombs, where the blessed dead waited to join Him in His resurrection, the beard, significative of the hopeless mourning and wailing of the pagans, was looked upon as unfitting the glorious risen Saviour. Only once before the third century is He represented with a beard, and then only at the Judgment. But "even in the fourth century," adds Wilpert, "the painters prefer the youthful type; and this is a proof that they did not intend portraiture."²

¹ p. 103.

² p. 233.

Indeed, actual portraiture seems alien to the spirit in which these paintings were made. That spirit was the sacramental spirit, and accordingly, with very few exceptions, the paintings in the catacombs are not historical but symbolic: that is, they were painted, not to represent an event that actually happened so that the observer could see it as it happened for the sake of its own interest or beauty; but they were painted to raise the mind of the beholder to a spiritual truth. "Instead of directly denoting the object," says Kleugner, "the forms of art became mere exponents of an abstract idea." Like the parables in the Gospels, they were real pictures, but symbolical, in order, as Northcote and Brownlow put it, "to suggest and teach religious truths by means of sights and acts of ordinary life, invested with a spiritual meaning."³ Thus from the Old Testament the most frequently selected subjects are Noe in the ark, symbolic of salvation; Abraham about to sacrifice Isaac, symbolic of Christ; Moses striking the rock, symbolic of the flowing waters of eternal life; the three children in the furnace, Daniel in the lion's den, Jonas in the belly of the whale, all symbolic of the safety of the Christian.⁴ The artists were not interested in historical accuracy; in fact, as Wilpert says, sometimes the face of Moses could be substituted for the face of Christ.⁵ For the pictures were never intended to be contemplated from the historical point of view, they express only the moral or devotional truth.⁶ De Rossi says: "The symbolical interpretation of the hieratic cycle is established beyond all dispute, not only by the choice and arrangement of subjects, but also by the mode of representing them."⁷

This symbolic principle is clearly manifest in the representations of Christ. The aim was not to depict Christ as He actually existed, laboured and suffered; but to declare by picture something of what He is in the life of a Christian. They do this, of course, by representing actual scenes from the Gospels; but these scenes are obviously selected and placed in the catacombs to declare and to suggest their faith: "Our Saviour Jesus Christ

³ p. 40, *Roma Sotterranea*, Vol. 2.

⁴ Cf. enumeration, Wilpert, pp. 17-19.

⁵ p. 102.

⁶ Cf. Northcote and Brownlow, p. 45.

⁷ Cited by N. and B., p. 46.

destroyed death and brought to light life and incorruption."⁸ And so He is found in these dark dank underground passages as the Good Shepherd; as raising Lazarus; as multiplying the loaves and fishes; as miraculously healing the paralytic at Bethsaida, the woman with the issue of blood, the man born blind; as talking of the waters of life to the sinful woman at the well in Samaria. But the favourite subject was the Good Shepherd, which occurs, according to Northcote and Brownlow, twice as often as any other subject, and by my own calculation from the List in Leclercq,⁹ more than five times as often as any other picture of Christ, except the raising of Lazarus.

In these pictures Christ is almost invariably boyish and beardless. His hair is short and He wears a short tunic girded round His loins, and sandals and laced greaves. Over the tunic He sometimes wears a mantle or coat of skin. The clothing is often adorned with flower-shaped ornaments or with stripes of colour. His head is almost invariably uncovered. In His left hand He bears His shepherd's crook, and sometimes in His right the milk-pail (*mulctra*) symbolic of Holy Communion. Often He carries the found sheep or lamb on His shoulders.¹⁰ The whole appearance is virile, noble and gracious, speaks of strength and joy, and symbolises, as Wilpert says,¹¹ in its youthfulness, the divine and changeless Christ, the same yesterday, to-day and forever. Judging from their pictures in the catacombs, these early Christians do not appear to have thought of Christ so much as the man of sorrows, bruised and afflicted, as of the triumphant Shepherd, from Whose hand no one can snatch His sheep. It was doubtless with reference to some of these pictures of the Good Shepherd, in which a goat instead of a sheep is carried, that Tertullian reproached St. Callixtus, "the good shepherd and blessed Pope," with "seeking to find his goats in the parable of the sheep."¹²

⁸ 2 Tim. i, 10. It is needless to recall that the catacombs were cemeteries and only occasionally places of refuge in persecution.

⁹ *Dictionnaire d' Archéologie Chrétienne*, Vol. 7, p. 2403 sq.

¹⁰ I have taken this almost verbatim from Farrar, *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art*, p. 43.

¹¹ p. 101.

¹² *De Pudic.* c. 13.

Considering the cheerful tone of these pictures in the catacombs, it is surprising that the tradition as to our Saviour's aspect is not unanimous; several of the Fathers, however, appear to have applied to Christ in a universal and absolute sense the prophecies of Isaias: "There is no beauty in Him nor comeliness," "despised and most abject of men,"¹³ which obviously only apply to Him in His passion. St. Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, though doubtfully, and St. Basil and St. Cyril accepted these prophecies as meaning that Christ was unprepossessing in human appearance. Other Fathers, however, held that He must have been noble and beautiful. St. Jerome says: "The brightness and majesty of His divinity shed its rays over His human countenance and subdued all who had the happiness to gaze upon it." He applies to Christ the Psalm: "Thou art fairer than the children of men," saying "unless He had possessed something starry (*sidereum quiddam*) in His face and in His eyes, the Apostles would never have followed Him at once nor would those who came to seize Him have fallen to the ground."¹⁴

Now this very difference of opinion, as Martigny well remarks, puts out of court at once the supposition that there existed any authentic portrait of Christ or even any trustworthy verbal description of Him. If it had, how easily could Origen have answered the taunt of the Jew Celsus that Christ was ill-favoured. If it had, St. Jerome would have known of it. He had visited the catacombs often and had lived in Italy, Greece, Asia Minor and Palestine. Or St. Augustine would have known it, for he likewise knew Rome, Milan and Africa, and knew of pictures of Christ. Yet both argue on *a priori* grounds and from what the prophets had said of Him, and simply ignore any "likeness" of Him that may have existed. Even supposing it did exist, it was not known and was never invoked to settle the question of our Saviour's appearance. Many pictures, indeed, were referred to in more or less apocryphal stories; the picture said to have been sent to Agbar of Edessa by Christ Himself, that painted by St. Luke, the carving attributed to Nicodemus, Veronica's statue at Pineas and others; but they may safely be ruled out as any secure source of

¹³ Is. 53.

¹⁴ In Ps. 44.

information. Farrar quotes St. Augustine: "Qua fuerit Ille facie, penitus ignoramus."¹⁵ Dr. Arendzen is right in saying: "We cannot truly speak of a traditional portrait of Christ."¹⁶

However, it may not be out of place to indicate that we have solid reasons for believing that our Lord was noble and beautiful in appearance. I quote from the rationalist, Keim, who thus gives what is really a scholastic argument: "We cannot easily think of the even balance and harmony of the spirit that rests in God, as united to bodily decrepitude, or even to a repellant physiognomy: we think of Him as healthy, vigorous, of expressive countenance, not, as Weiner and Hase supposed on insufficient grounds, without characteristic features; as if a Spirit and a will like His must not needs create what was full of character."¹⁷ And of the evidence from the Gospels, the same author says: "It is plain His was a manly, commanding, prophetic figure. The people, so much at the mercy of outward impressions, could not otherwise have greeted Him, especially just after John, as a prophet and as the Son of David; and the reproach of His foes would have attacked Him even on the side of bodily defects. Besides, we have the fact that His appearance on the scene, His words, His eye, seized and shook the hearers and beholders; the fact that men, women, children, sick and poor felt happy at His feet and in His presence."¹⁸

But a still stronger argument, to my mind, is the sense of the faithful. This was clearly manifested to me one day by a very simple old woman who had lost her only son. In the corridor of the convent where she was staying there was a Pieta. Coming out of the chapel she saw it, looked at it and wept. Then throwing her arms about it, she said: "Aye, mither, Ye've lost your bonny Boy, as I've lost mine." There was manifest the unreflecting yet certain *sensus fidelium*. Mary's Son *must* have been "bonny."

Personally, I feel glad that we have not a "likeness" of our Saviour. A portrait is the transference into colour

¹⁵ *De Trinitate*, 8, 5.

¹⁶ *Men and Manners in the Days of Christ*, p. 93.

¹⁷ *Life of Christ*, Vol. 2, 193 E.T.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

and form of one symbolic flash of vision into a human soul. Of its nature, it is personal to the artist, even while it is representative of the object, and is really one man's moment of intuition shining upon canvas and therefore it does not exhaust the object. Now what painter, even if he had looked upon the face of our Lord, could find the soul behind, and so paint that the imaged face showed forth the character, the mind, the heart? How paint the looks that children found so winning, the expression the young man saw when Christ looked on him and loved him, the look that pierced the soul of Peter in the courtyard, when "the Lord, turning, looked on Peter"? "If the face of man reflects the soul," wrote Didon, "Jesus must have been the most beautiful among the sons of men. The light of God, veiled by the shadow of sorrow, illuminated His brow with a softened splendour which no human art could ever succeed in painting." Would not any "likeness" fail of the reality, and fail likewise in answering our expectations? "It would be heaven to me," wrote Rutherford, "just to peep through a hole in heaven's doors to see Christ's countenance."¹⁹ Our Saviour in life must have drawn to Him every man of good will; indeed Origen suggested that His aspect varied with the spiritual capacities of the beholder. It is repellant to think that a "likeness" of Him might have failed to appeal to some men of good will. Speaking of certain pictures of Christ and the saints, Father Martindale asks: "What happens when a boy or girl wakes up to the fact not only that our Lord, or even the saints, could not possibly have looked like that, but that we could not have stood it for a moment if they *had* looked like that?"²⁰ Personally, the so-called "traditional likeness" does not appeal to me; I am very glad indeed that our Lord did not look like that. "It is expedient for you that I go," He said: yet how could it possibly be expedient for us that we should not have His physical presence amongst us? He gave us the answer Himself: the gift of the Holy Spirit. He went from us Himself and He left us no portrait, possibly that we may conceive Him more spiritually and cultivate more generously that purity of heart by which we shall one day see Him face to face in the courts of everlasting day.

¹⁹ Cited by Whyte in *Lectures*, ch. 3, p. 27.

²⁰ *Month*, November, '22, p. 396.

“MEN OF LITTLE SHOWING”

(4) PROVOST WALMSLEY.

BY THE REV. CUTHBERT WARING, M.A.

IN his later years, at least, there was in his eyes a look of peace the memory of which will be cherished by those who lived with him. It was the quiet, steady look of one who was not greatly concerned with the world and its ways. He had done his work. He was humble in his estimate of its worth and he did not allow the opinions of others to disturb him. He cared neither for the applause of men, nor for their criticism. He made no effort to impress others, to lead the conversation, to be the lion, though he had the learning and the ability which would have carried him far. If he had not the anxious look of one who plays for high stakes and is uneasy whether the result will excuse the risk, it was not that he had no great aim in life. His was the highest of all, and his calmness was the outcome of the wisdom of it.

His mien bore out the same impression. He was erect. His white hair made him venerable. His forehead was broad and high. His face was fresh and wonderfully smooth for a man of eighty, but there was no suggestion of mere ease and comfort. It was the face of one who for many years had carried heavy and lonely responsibility. His head was set straight, suggestive of strength without arrogance, of self-control, of great patience. Still, that quiet look predominated.

Some thought he was hard and unsympathetic. In his dealings with a large number of young men who had to be trained to be hard with themselves there may occasionally have been words or actions which gave that impression; but those who have seminaries to deal with know how easy it is for young men to become hypersensitive about their health, and will realise in consequence how great was the value of that sanity of which he gave so good an example. No one wanted to be ill in those days—and very few were ill. If he was hard in dealing with men, it was because he knew how much they would need the lesson. To the young children who

filled the College when the War had taken the students, and to the young boys who came up in the joyous resurrection of 1920, he showed a kindness which brought Prefects to the verge of despair. He would not have the small boys punished, and the old-fashioned ferula which had put the elements of manliness into many a generation—which had awakened the rationality of many an arrival, now lay a useless relic! Some thought the race deteriorated sadly.

His kindness and forbearance to us on the staff has been to me an ever-increasing marvel. With one exception all who came to Upholland in January, 1930, to renew the life within its walls were young men, fifty years younger than the Canon. We re-acted gaily to a little leisure after a heavy morning. We were hardly companions for him, and our light-heartedness, to use the pleasantest term, must at times have been trying. Yet he was always pleasant and patient. He even commended us in public and said what splendid fellows we were! It seemed quite natural to me then, but I have grown up since and I marvel at it now!

The tendency of modern times seems to be to make much of advertisement, of appearances, to the neglect perhaps of reality. That was not his way. Those who love the old Provost do no more than think of what he was.

He was in the Chapel every morning for meditation before the bell rang. We cannot on this side of eternity estimate the good he and Canon Banks did in that respect. Many would have excused themselves on the plea of age. Some might have felt too old at 26. He was not too old at 80; no! or at 86 either, though he had but a few weeks to live. And who will forget the way he knelt? Lounging of any kind annoyed him. He knelt straight, resting his hands on the bench before him, but never his elbows. A few heroic souls imitated him, and I have seen the trait in choice men of two generations. May they be bishops in their day!

For Mass in later years he went to the Carmelite Convent. It involved a walk across the fields, and in wet and cold weather it was anything but pleasant. His old ulster was his only extra protection on bad days, and anxiety for his safety sometimes on the very casual path-

way was not unfounded. One day he came back a mass of mud. He had slipped and fallen, and from the look of him he must have rocked about in the mire for some time before he could regain his feet. But he was not distressed, and he told us about it as though it was quite amusing. More than once he was lost in the fog, but "Providence," he used to say, "takes care of three classes—old men, drunkards and fools." When he arrived at the Convent he could not look forward to comfort. The good nuns also believed in the hard life. The constant lesson of severe mortification which their lives taught was no doubt one of the secrets of the attraction which Carmel had for him. But cold or wet or darkness, fog, snow or rain, never drew from him the slightest suggestion of complaint. It was not that he was impervious to these things. His fingers were swollen and shapeless with cold, but he stood it all with a manliness which we should now call heroism.

It was the same with the ordinary course of life. To have allowed himself to "be bored," would have meant to have failed in the Christian virtue of patience. Any savage can be pleasant while he is pleased! Whatever he had to do, he did with unruffled constancy. While he was able to teach, he taught. When he could no longer teach, he had the more time for his prayers. That he found it a great trial to be unable to do the ordinary work there can be no doubt. "After eighty," he would warn us, "it is all 'labor et dolor.'" Yet he never uttered a word which suggested weariness or a hankering after other places less arduous. He had been rector of a mission before going to Upholland in 1894, and when his responsibilities and anxieties increased he never spoke with impatience of his difficulties or expressed a desire to be rid of them. He had been given a work to do and he did it. The "Qui fit, Mæcenas," was magnificently falsified in him.

Sometimes he spoke of his early days. If I remember rightly, he went by coach as a boy to Liverpool, there to join the boat which was to take him to Santander and from there he went on by coach to Valladolid. After being ordained he went to the Isle of Man, and for some time he had to live in rooms in an inn. While in the island he had been assistant to Archbishop Errington, and always spoke with admiration for his priestly char-

acter. Life had not been easy for him then, but he was full of cheery good humour, and his sufferings spoiled neither his temper nor his constitution. He enjoyed the big-hearted, generous Irish students who, he knew, would do great work afterwards. "We are in the right place, Canon," said one of them when the Canon had taken him to the Museum to give him some idea of how to sing! The Canon's voice was not a thing of beauty, and his demonstrations were an excruciating joy—but he had a wonderful ear and he knew singing when he heard it. Strange to say, it was one subject on which he showed signs of "nerves." Flighty music irritated him; the boisterous bellowings of enthusiasts tore agonising gasps from him. Battles royal were fought over the various kinds of music, and not every piece of plain chant won his admiration. But his opponents often paid the warmest tributes to his judgment.

Indeed, "balance" is often spoken of as the classic characteristic of the classical Greek. The Provost was balance personified. And not in a merely negative way either. He was a scholar amongst scholars. We were lucky enough to have with us a classical master of real learning and discriminating taste, an artist in writing whether in English, Latin or Greek; one who gave distinction to two universities by being a Master of Arts in both, and he taught Latin and Greek to boys who mostly were unable to appreciate their good fortune! He read much of the classics, yet I do not remember his mentioning one book of which the Provost could not give him the gist. He must have read very widely while studying or teaching at Valladolid, and his memory was astonishing. Nor was his knowledge confined to the classics. Those who knew more than the average amount of history—whether secular or ecclesiastical—could appeal to him with confidence for the answer to any difficulty. Once in eight years I enjoyed the luxury of correcting him, and that was in the matter of a date of no great consequence which I had just looked up! When put to the test he had an astonishing knowledge of literature, too, though I doubt if he considered learning in such subjects as of any great value. In Moral Theology and Ascetical he was a master. His lectures in Moral must have been rich with that wealth of reading and experience which gave weight to his words and to his judgment.

In Ascetics it was obvious that for much of the time he was looking down into the depths of his own soul. It was then that everyone learnt to admire the old man, who spoke with such humility and with such a pathetic anxiety to be of service to others. (Those lectures were a revelation to some who could not fairly have been put in the same class as Cataline!) There he turned himself inside out for our benefit, and for one who was by nature shy and retiring, it was an act of no small virtue. He was well qualified to deal with the development of souls. In his younger days he had lived with the saints and his "conversation" was with them in his old age. Had he wished to display his knowledge, he would have been one of the greatest authorities on St. Theresa. He read Spanish with ease and spoke it with more elegance than he cared to show in English. His understanding of Spain's great saint was profound, and his devotion to her was not less. There stands now in the beautiful College Chapel at Upholland an altar to St. Theresa—the last gift of the Very Reverend Provost Walmsley. That is really more remarkable than appears at first sight. If any man was poor in spirit, he was; anyone detached from the goods of earth, it was he. He gave away freely whatever money came to him. If the "careful Lancashire spirit" ever possessed him, he had driven it out. Yet he kept sufficient for that altar to St. Theresa—he who was so pre-eminently a man's man! So shall they prove that he was not merely arid nor cramped, but there were depths in him beyond the comprehension of the ordinary mind.

And death came to him, as it comes to all—the final test. In Ascetics lectures he always spoke of it with fear. Many will remember how he would join his hands and close his eyes and seem to make himself very small in the face of it. "*Portantes manipulos nostros*" suggested to him how little we had to offer. But when death actually came, there was no fear. On the evening of his last day several of us were gathered in his room to pray for him as he would have us pray. He had taught us, had been our guide and confessor; had testified that so far as human frailty could be, we were fit to be priests. He had been to us a model of Christian virtue, never sparing himself, never putting himself forward, patient, humble, faithful beyond anything we could hope to achieve—the first before the Blessed Sacrament in the

morning, and though an old man of eighty-six, more than half blind, more than half deaf, the last to leave at night—yet after all this he turned on his elbow that evening and begged our pardon for any bad example he had given. No mere display of dramatic art this! but the naked grandeur of his genuine humility.

His last words are preserved for us in the panegyric preached by Monsignor Dean. The Canon had been Rector of a Mission for fourteen years and Rector of the College for another thirty-two—forty-six years of authority—yet he retained the simple obedience of a child; and at the mention of obedience he controlled the natural restlessness of the sick and the dying. He would rightly be classed among the great if only because he gave so perfect an example of a virtue which, though perhaps easy to acquire, is so difficult to retain.

He made no great stir in the world. He did not write books, he was not a coiner of phrases, nor a great talker or preacher; he was not one who drew attention to himself, but year after year priests left Upholland inspired with zeal for the work of the mission and equipped with the knowledge necessary for their work. They were ready to go to any place, to put up with difficulty and hardship, to set out every morning to visit their people—devoted men, asking no reward in this world, content to labour unknown, faithful themselves to their religious duties, priests worthy of the magnificent traditions of the Catholic North. It was here that he did his work. He did not make books, or money, or reputation, or sensation, or novelties; he was a man and a maker of men; a maker of a diocese. No wonder there was that quiet steady look in his eyes!

PLAINSONG FOR THE PEOPLE

BY THE REV. A. G. McDONALD,

Oscott College.

IN view of the fact that musicians are sensitive and Church-musicians very sensitive, it is imperative that such an article as this bear upon its front certain prefatory reassurances. Implied criticism of the Solesmes theory of plainsong rhythm is unavoidable in saying what we wish to say, but such criticism is not our primary intent. Since first we heard the Benedictine Fathers sing in their temporary church at Appledurcombe some thirty years ago, we have remained convinced of the objective beauty of their performances. In fact, the peculiar quality of delicacy that characterizes their singing is one of the pivotal points upon which our argument turns. Secondly, we are keenly appreciative of the courageous work of the recently founded Society of St. Gregory, of which we enjoy membership. If anything which follows should seem to militate against what is a veritable apostolate on the part of its directors, we beg our readers to believe in the sincerity of our intention to criticize constructively.

It is probably unnecessary to remind the reader that the Apostolic Constitution of the present Pope on Church Music laid new and particular emphasis upon Pius X's ardent desire that the Sacred Chant should be restored to the people—that the laity should be brought into closer and more intelligent participation of the Mass and the Divine Office by being taught to sing at least some parts of the Liturgy. This article is inspired by the fear that there are at least two outstanding tendencies in the present efforts at reform which threaten to jeopardise success in that especial direction. They are the undeniable complexity of the Solesmes method of interpreting the Chant, and the attempt to compass an unattainable uniformity by the adoption of that method in school and church.

No priest who has outgrown his first youthful idealism can possibly entertain hopes of getting a normal congregation to sing with anything but a very rudimentary

ensemble. If he prevails upon his people as a whole to sing at all he will have accomplished a great deal. It takes heroic faith to remove the mountain of prejudice against singing in church as a lapse from gentility. Yet a reform of this kind must first commend itself to the common sense of the clergy. They know their people, and their outlook is severely practical. They have probably burnt their fingers more than once in the choir gallery and will be chary of making a complete holocaust of themselves in the body of the church. Unless we are prepared to meet them innocent of all preciousness and with ideals well hidden under a simple practical plan, we may as well relegate plainsong to the monasteries.

It seems clear to us that whatever hopes of a uniform interpretation of the Chant were raised by the publication of the Vatican text, were immediately dashed by the appearance of the Solesmes books with added signs. They were then, and still are, an apple of discord. Indeed, the Holy See was so alarmed for the integrity of the melodies it had laboriously restored, that the new versions from Solesmes were condemned out of hand. They were afterwards revised to comply with the letter of the law, and a subsequent decree of the S.C.R. noted them as *precarie toleratae*. Since that time they have attained such publicity that "Solesmes Chant" for thousands of people is synonymous with "plainsong" and one has met many priests who "have not so much as heard" of the Typical Vatican Edition which resulted from the labours of the Commission appointed by Pius X. This is undoubtedly a tribute to the initiative and energy of Dom Mocquereau, the gifted originator of the Solesmes system, and to the business enterprise of his publishers, whose well known *Liber Usualis*, being a cheap compendium of the *Graduale* and the *Vesperale*, has commended itself to the purses of those who are unable to afford the more expensive official books. Yet the fact remains that the *Editio Typica Vaticana*, so little known in England, is the only fully authorized text, from the making of which the rhythmic theories of Dom Mocquereau were definitely excluded, as was he himself from the Commission which produced it. The existence of these rival versions is a difficulty in the way of unity of rendering, because a choice must now be made between the unadorned text and that of Solesmes.

The Society of St. Gregory, at a recent Oxford Summer School, elected to adopt the Solesmes version, the directors adding their opinion that by the use of these books alone "could a uniform and correct tradition of rendering the Chant be built up." There is charm in the piquancy of this profession of faith in a system whose very existence is the negation of uniformity! But the matter seems to us to become more than merely amusing when it is borne in mind that according to a decree dated January 1911, the Sacred Congregation of Rites declared that "The Vatican Edition of the Gregorian Liturgical books, as published by Apostolic Authority, with its traditional notation and with the rules placed at the beginning of the Roman Gradual, contains sufficiently and even abundantly (*satis superque*) all that is needed for an exact rendering of the Chant." There follows a statement to the effect that the books with rhythmic signs are not to be called "editions," and other interesting matter which we do not reproduce for fear of seeming to be inspired by animus—and the decree finishes thus: "It is permitted to Ordinaries to allow for the present the books '*precarie toleratae*' by the Holy See, with the proviso that they be not imposed, or the use of the approved Edition interfered with." This legislation was confirmed in 1917, and we can find no subsequent modification of it. Seeing, therefore, that the Holy See has abundantly provided for the correctness of the interpretation of the Chant in its own official books, and thereby established a criterion of uniformity, both the correctness and the uniformity said to be obtainable from the Solesmes books and desired by the Society of St. Gregory are in excess of what the Holy See demands.

We have insisted somewhat upon this point because it is precisely the element of excess in precision and the insistence on standards unattainable by ordinary folk, that alienates the sympathies of those whose whole-hearted co-operation is essential to the success of the cause we all have at heart. We are not so foolish as to suppose that Plainsong can be made positively easy, nor, we hope, so inartistic as to be satisfied with anything but the best performance that can be obtained with the material at hand in the average parish. A dozen years of practical experience, both on the mission and in the seminary, has taught us that *ne quid nimis* is the golden adage in this matter as in most.

Moreover, even apart from what we consider to be a desertion of the Vatican Edition in favour of a less practical guide, we are convinced that the Solesmes books are in no way more productive of uniformity of rendition amongst those who use them than are the plain Vatican texts. We who do not subscribe to Dom Mocquereau's rhythmic system are sometimes brought to book on account of our differences, but the publication of gramophone records of two monastic choirs singing the same music furnishes illuminating evidence that we are not alone in this respect, and incidentally supports our contention that perfect uniformity in these matters is, humanly speaking, impossible, even amongst the elect. If uniformity in singing means anything at all it means that those between whom it exists will observe the same pauses, the same variations of volume and speed. The Solesmes books are said to ensure that this shall be so, and it is claimed for them that they are a protection against the vagaries of individualistic interpretations. Yet in so simple an example of the Chant as the short tone to the *Salve Regina* the choir of Solesmes and that of Ampleforth Abbey disagree on points most intimately connected with the very element in the Chant which they have taken as their special province—its rhythm. The various kinds of bar-lines, marking the larger contours of the melody, are not only undifferentiated by the same choir, but are differently interpreted by each. The Solesmes Fathers, moreover, double the value of the notes on the last syllables of *ergo* and *vita*—they shorten the two notes on the first syllable of *clemens* to the value of one; a pause for breath is made after *oculos* which completely alters the rhythmic balance of the phrase. None of these things are done by the Ampleforth Schola. Had the two choirs been singing together, the whole antiphon would have been spoilt by lack of rhythmic agreement, and the English singers would have outrun the French as did John Peter. Our curiosity did not take us beyond the comparison of this one item in the two sets, but it is obvious that so great a latitude of rhythmic freedom is native to Solesmes, that not even the multitudinous signs in their own books are observed in accordance with their own rules. These records, prepared, one presumes, with the greatest care, forever dispose of anything that may henceforth be said as to the insufficiency of the plain

text as a guide to rhythm, compared with the help given by the signs.

Nor is it just that the undeniable, and indeed exquisite, beauty of the actual singing as here rendered should be ascribed, as it often has been, to the peculiar virtues of the Solesmes method. It should be noted that all the elements in such singing which so charm the ear, are provided for and inculcated by the official instructions of the Roman books—the smoothness, the slow and gentle rounding off of phrases, the lack of dramatic effects, the reticent control of mere volume which goes so far to produce the sense of “otherworldness”; the delicate renewal of energy on the initial notes of the neums, giving a live pulse and onward movement to the singing—all these things were prescribed as of the essence of Plain-song before the French rhythmic versions appeared. The one characteristic of the Solesmes system which more than any other detracts from the beauty of the Chant, is the constant and irritating warfare between the natural rhythm of the verbal text and the obtruded counter-ictus of the melody, hardly noticeable indeed to French ears, but painful in the extreme to all who are alive to the subtle values of the spoken word, and so loth to have them sacrificed to the domination of the music’s independent rhythm. The Vatican Introduction insists on the primacy of the verbal text—the Solesmes system on that of the music—the former is officially proposed for the obedience of the whole Church, the latter is an ingenious but a private theory.

Must the practical priest on the mission deduce from all this that where experts disagree it is not for him to choose, and so remain inactive and indifferent? By no means. Much as we deplore the fact that the rhythmic versions are so widely used and the plain text so little known in our country, we can assure any who share our feelings that the excellent manuals lately published for use in schools, where all the good work has to be done, may be safely adopted, if they are used with discretion. What we have heard well described as a “non-pedantic” use of these elementary books may even save teachers and priests much trouble, because the Solesmes notation, as regards its less recondite signs, is indeed a labour-saving device. In the case of the more obscure indications—such as the vertical episema—the

preface to "Plainsong for Schools," by the nuns of Stanbrook Abbey, assures us that the stresses marked by the episema "should be as much in the singer's mind as in his voice"; a cryptic saying which may be interpreted to mean that no notice need be taken of them at all. Indeed, from exhaustive enquiries made amongst those who use the Solesmes books, we have elicited the fact that many of them are not much concerned with the signs, if indeed at all acquainted with their meaning, beyond the one instance that a dot after a note doubles its length.

There is a certain irony in the fact that the most accessible edition of the Vatican Gradual for limited purses has been produced by the Anglican community at Nashdom, Bucks. It is fortified with the imprimatur of our own Authorities at Westminster, and has the advantage of an excellent translation of the Introduction so often referred to in this article. We unhesitatingly recommend it to those who may hitherto have been frightened by the supposed complexities of Plainsong, as an easy way of reassuring themselves that the Church's Song is not by any means intended to be the preserve of aesthetes or experts, but that it yields up its secrets easily and sweetly to all who are ready to give it the consideration it deserves.

In conclusion we would ask if there is any need for a soul-deadening uniformity in the rendering of the Chant such as would be considered intolerable in any other kind of music. Even if the thing could be done, would it be desirable in itself? We do not allude, of course, to unanimity amongst the singers in any given choir—it goes without saying that this must be aimed at; and we hold that the instructions given by the Holy See are adequate to attain it. Our remarks have been directed towards discouraging the intransigent idealism which would hope to establish a world-wide uniformity in the singing of the Chant, and especially towards showing that the refinements which may be possible in the case of monastic communities with their opportunities of daily rehearsal and intensive specialization, must not be allowed to become a source of discouragement to those on whom our hopes of a sound tradition in church-music ultimately rest. We are not merely surmising that the danger exists, we have had practical and re-

peated experience of its reality. We have known cultivated musicians stand aghast at the burden laid upon the student of Plainsong by our idealistic experts. We could name parish after parish in which the cause of good music has lain dormant for years as the result of an exaggerated notion of the difficulties of the Chant engendered by the jargon of pundits. Pope Pius X was very well aware of this threat to his dream of giving back the Chant to simple folk, and he took strong action. It seems, however, that the evil was no more than stemmed, and that the menace is still with us.

HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. H. E. CALNAN, D.D.

Nineteenth Sunday after Pentecost (October 4th).

Gospel. (Matthew xxii. 1-14.)

OCCASION : It was the Tuesday (or possibly the Wednesday) after the first Palm Sunday, and Our Lord was in the Temple. Within the past few days He had for the second time asserted His authority in the Temple, ejecting the money changers and the buyers and sellers, and curing the blind and the lame within the Temple precincts : He was now walking about teaching the people with more authority than any Rabbi among the Pharisees. The chief priests, therefore, with the Scribes and the elders (representative of the Sanhedrin) now challenged Him for His authority. He replied by challenging them to state their opinion of the Baptism and preaching of John the Baptist : and it was a shrewd answer. He followed this up with four parables, all of them exposing the perversity of the Jews, and foretelling their coming retribution and the acceptance of the Gentiles. The last of these parables was this one.

EXPLANATION : The invited guests were the Jews. And to them the invitation had been brought long ago by the Prophets and Patriarchs.

“ All things were ready ” with the completion of the Incarnation. Further servants were therefore sent ; viz., Christ Himself and His Apostles. But the call was in vain. Some held worldly riches (the farm, the country estate), and were themselves held thereby. Others were busy collecting wealth through merchandise ; and they, too, were held by their commercial ties. Others were hostile : downright enemies of the King : so they slew the Servant of Jahweh, and slew His Apostles, too, and their city.

The destruction of “ those murderers ” was affected by Titus and Vespasian, unwitting instruments of God’s justice.

Meantime the Apostles and their successors had been sent to proclaim the King’s invitation at the crossroads, and along the king’s highways—at Antioch, at Philippi, at Ephesus, at Corinth, along the Mediterranean trade-routes, at Rome—“ to all nations,” collecting them into the King’s banquet.

And the “ wedding garment ” can be nothing but Charity, sanctifying grace, made available to all who enter, by the very fact of entry. The supernatural life of the soul is the Life of Christ, given for us on Calvary, given to us in Baptism. (And renewed, of course, in the other Sacraments.) Its absence in the Christian soul implies an actual state of defiance and revolt, arising from deliberate hostile attack. The man without the wedding-garment, was a rebel, an enemy of the King. He was

present under false pretences, gross, violent and blatant. Helpless in the hands of God's loyal ministers, he meets the penalty of his treason.

He is an example of the many Christians who, having begun well, turn aside from virtue, and are finally lost: the multitude who having received the call to the Faith of Christ, either refuse to obey at all, or obey only for a time. "Many are called, but few are chosen."

REFLECTIONS: Our Lord used a very apt figure in speaking of the call of all mankind to faith in Christ as a marriage-feast. In the Incarnation, the human nature common to all mankind was united to the Person of God the Son, by a Union so unique and unparalleled, that only after centuries of careful thought were the Fathers of the Church able to find a single term to describe it with any degree of technical accuracy. By the Hypostatic Union the Catholic Church means that the Divine and the Human Natures of Christ are henceforth indissolubly united in One Person. Never henceforth can the almighty and eternal Word of God be other than Jesus of Nazareth, born of Mary at Bethlehem, crucified and buried at Jerusalem, risen and ascended into Heaven. Mary's Son is God: and Mary is God's Mother.

But in the Incarnation, the human nature united to God was the one individual human nature of Jesus of Nazareth. The status of human nature in general undoubtedly was raised thereby; and henceforth the human nature of the rest of mankind could boast that glorious Representative. But it was not enough for the love borne to us by Him who "for us and for our salvation came down from Heaven." Closer still would He draw mankind: not merely representatively, but in objective fact. This He did by founding the Church. And the Church is His Spouse, living on His Life sacrificed on Calvary that the Church might have it. It is a thought that continually recurs in Our Lord's discourse after the Last Supper; and not for the first time there. And day by day in the Mass, this Divine Life is infused afresh and ever more abundantly into the veins of the Church, His Spouse, which is also His own mystical Body. "They shall be two in one flesh." That is the Union "in Christ and in the Church" from which the marriage of man and woman draws its sacramental significance, making it a sign producing the grace that it signifies. It follows at once that Christian marriage must be indissoluble.

We are members of the Church. And we are living members because, and so long as, we share the life of the Church which is the Life of the Risen Christ. When once this Life has been infused into us by Baptism, its energising flow can be checked or stopped only by the personal choice of personal sin: the personal treason of setting a creature of God above its Almighty and Eternal Creator. That is sin's attack on God's supremacy: gross treachery, too, since the soul attacks its own Guest on whose Life it lives: and abysmal unreason, because this Guest is Him-

self the Incarnate Wisdom of God. Our Lord reminds us that wealth possessing its owner will perpetrate this hideous folly: wealth enslaving him who hunts it will do it: pride and anger and sloth, or any other of that ugly company will do it. The attack is futile, of course, but it is real; futile because it is the finite trying to control the Infinite; real, because it deals death to the attacker. Becoming God's active enemy, the soul rejects God's friendship, casts out God's Wisdom and Love, casts out its Divine Guest.

There is our "wedding garment." And so long as the soul is clothed with the Lord Jesus Christ, all the spiritual abundance of the King's Banquet is at our disposal. We have the prayers and devotions of Christian worship; we have the Holy Scriptures; we have the wisdom of Christian literature, fruit of Christian life and experience; we have the example of the Saints; we have the works of mercy and of penance. Above all, we have the completeness of the Sacramental system: the beauty and majesty and efficacy of Christian liturgy: the Holy Eucharist itself, that sacred banquet *par excellence*, in which the Living Christ Himself comes to us again and again with ever richer pledges of future glory.

He came, as He said—that we might have life and have it more abundantly. "He that eateth me the same also shall live by me."

Twentieth Sunday after Pentecost (October 11th).

Gospel. (John iv. 46-52.)

In Our Lord's words to the Ruler, there was a clear rebuke; "Unless you see signs and wonders, you do not believe." The man clearly considered Jesus to be a useful wonder-worker; but he did not believe Him to be the Son of God with omnipotence to control both distance and death. Nor did he attend to Our Lord's rebuke; he merely insisted "Lord, come down before my son dieth," and showed his fault more clearly. It was like Our Lord to grant the miracle, nevertheless.

We must notice that Our Lord said "You," not "Thou." The rebuke was for the rest of the Jews, as well as for the Ruler. The prophecies of the Old Testament which were being fulfilled before their eyes, should have been, for all of them, sufficient motive for complete faith. Right back from the times of Abraham and the Prophets, Jahweh had been cherishing and instructing the Chosen People, precisely that they should recognize the Messiah when He came. Still demanding signs and wonders, they earned Our Lord's rebuke.

The sufficiency of the Scriptures in this direction may have been in Our Lord's mind at Cana. He changed the water into wine, only at the request of His Mother, and only after some demur because His hour had not yet come. For the company was probably exclusively Jewish, and it was at the very outset of His public life, when He could scarcely yet have come to the notice of the Gentiles.

The Gentiles had not had the same preparation. And Christ came for all mankind—"a Light to the revelation of the Gentiles." To the Gentiles, too, then, the Divinity of this Man had to be made plain; and the prophecies of Jewish literature would have little weight here. Hence, Jesus proved His Divinity by signs and wonders, works which only God could do. The Jews should have been ready to believe His *words*; but even to them He said: "The works that I do in the name of my Father, they give testimony of me." And again, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though you will not believe me, believe the works: that you may know and believe that the Father is in Me, and I in the Father." (John x. 25, 37.)

St. Paul saw this difference, too. In I Cor. xiv. 22, he says, in effect, that signs and wonders are for unbelievers; for believers there are the Scriptures. So did St. Peter. For after relating (II Peter i. 16, ff.) his own experience of the signs and wonders performed by Our Lord, he significantly adds, "we have the more firm prophetic word"; and he is thus led to utter his famous warning against private judgment in the interpretation of the Scriptures. In the composition of the Gospels, also, there is this consciousness of different needs. St. Matthew, writing chiefly for Jews, insists on Christ's fulfilment of the prophecies, and his Gospel teems with quotations from the Old Testament. St. Mark writes chiefly for Gentiles; and his is aptly called the "Gospel of miracles"; he shows Our Lord as the wonder-worker, absolute Master not only of nature in all its forms and activities, but also of devils.

The lesson has its value to-day. The Jews of Our Lord's day should not have needed the personal experience of signs and wonders before believing Christ's words. Neither should we. We have all that they had, and immeasurably more. We have all that He gave the Gentiles, too, and again immeasurably more. We have the cold reality of the Church as a phenomenon of history; and we have our own knowledge of what the Church is and does.

Its doctrine covers all we need to know concerning God, our neighbour and ourselves; telling us what we are, whence we came, and whither we go, and how we have to treat our fellow travellers. Never has there been a philosophy of life submitted to a closer or more unremitting scrutiny. Yet the more it is studied, the firmer is its grip. The Creed has stood the wear and tear of two thousand years of traffic along the highways and byeways of life; it has come unscathed through the most formidable buffeting ever known. Despite the subtleties of Greek heretics, despite the fire and eloquence of Luther coupled with the political opportunism of poverty-stricken princes, despite the scoffs of Voltaire in days when mockery could kill, not a line of our Creed has been broken, not a sentence has been suppressed. And in our own day, scientists, genuine and spurious, who renounce their proper function and parade as philosophers, prophets, and preachers, hurl their scientific authority against

this Rock, and achieve merely the shattering of their own reputation.

The divine perfection of its moral law has compelled the acknowledgement even of its enemies—a Voltaire, a Diderot, a Renan, a Locke. History gives proof after proof that Christianity is the only sure shield a nation has against selfishness and sensuality and cruelty, brutal and nation-wide. As a nation loses its grip on Christianity, it loses its grip on the sacredness of human life and of bodily integrity, and on the human rights of the weak in general and of women in particular. Christianity stands alone as a capable champion of healthy civilization and of true human liberty. No intelligence short of the Divine could have evolved such a system.

It began with a group in a room in Jerusalem. In one day it grew to three thousand; then to five thousand. Persecution, systematic, determined, official, began within a year or two, and was continued for three hundred years by the power of Cæsar, with the forces of money and men and public opinion that Cæsar can command. But from all this, Christianity emerged serene, powerful, highly organized, world-wide. Add now the constancy of the multitude of martyrs; add the treason of heretics; add the scandal of unworthy Christians, the machinations of ambitious princes, and the scheming of unscrupulous statesmen; and see verified to-day the argument which Augustine applied to the Christianity of his day. Either grant the miracles evident in the Church's history, or say there are none. If there are none, then a doctrine and a discipline opposed to all human pride and passion, first preached by a small group of illiterates, have been propagated and preserved in this astonishing fashion, without any miracle at all. And of all miracles that would be surely the biggest! All the laws of ordinary human action are against it. In either event the hand of God is evident: the discerning mind must accept the conclusion that Christianity comes from Almighty God, with His authority. We have no need for further "signs and wonders."

Twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost (October 18th).

Gospel. (Matthew xviii. 23-35.)

EXPLANATION: In the concluding words of to-day's Gospel, Our Lord Himself sums up its lesson: "So shall my heavenly Father do to you, if you forgive not every one his brother from your hearts."

This insistence on genuine interior forgiveness shows that Our Lord is speaking not of mere debts to be cancelled, but of the forgiveness of injuries, the genuine pardon of offences. And Our Lord intends to show how trivial is the thing that we are called upon to forgive—even "seventy times seven times"—when compared with what God is prepared to forgive us.

Sin involves not only that attack on God's supremacy, at which we glanced in the Gospel for the Nineteenth Sunday, but

also a definite robbery. We steal away from God, honour that ought to go to Him. Consideration and service which belong to Him, we embezzle and employ for our own ends. That debt remains, or can remain, even after the offence is forgiven: hence temporal punishment. And God forgives not only the offence of sin, but will cancel this temporal punishment, too; by adult Baptism, for instance, and through the treasury of His Church, by Indulgences.

Ten thousand talents is an enormous fortune. Darius thought it a sum capable of tempting Alexander to leave Asia alone. It was the price Haman offered a wealthy Persian king for permission to exterminate all Jews from the kingdom. It was the amount of the fine imposed by the Romans on Antiochus. It can represent sums from two millions to sixty millions of pounds, according to the kind of talents concerned—Attic, or Jewish silver, or Jewish gold. This servant, then, was evidently some great minister of state, or some subordinate ruler. The fact that by selling him, and his wife and children, and his property, his lord could hope for some repayment, shews that Jesus was thinking of a man of considerable substance. And our Lord's intention here, was to point out the enormity of the debt we incur by sin.

A hundred pence, if we take the Roman denarius as equivalent to about sevenpence-halfpenny, would be little more than three pounds. So Our Lord's comparison is thus far complete. The creditor himself seems to have been ashamed to mention the exact sum.

REFLECTIONS: Here, too, we have lessons valuable for all time. Our view of the injuries done to us by our neighbour is usually magnified, and often distorted. And life thus collects fresh loads of ugliness and harshness and bitterness and mischief; of which Our Lord gives us a vivid example. It was just His kindness not to add: "Thou art the man." He points out to us that life would be well rid of all this, if we would see our own sins as the enormous evil that they are.

A finite agent, restricted in vision, clouded in intellect, warped and enfeebled in will, seeks to set itself above and beyond God's supreme and almighty wisdom. The injury it attempts, the offence it offers, the fantastic futility it achieves, is measured against the Infinite Excellence of the God whom it would dethrone and replace. It wrecked the human race: having already turned angels into devils. The Living Christ is cast out from the soul to whom He has given His own Life. Eternal destiny is frustrated. Gross and crude mockery is made of the Incarnation, the Crucifixion, the whole economy of Redemption, with all its episodes, tragic and tender. Remorse, hardness, coarseness follow, further to degrade and cripple and embitter human life. And through neglect and bad example, injustice and further suffering are piled up in the path of the helpless and the innocent. Thus did we need that Christ should come "to convince the world of sin and of justice and of judgment"!

And this is the work that the Church is doing to-day. The mistake of the pagan world of to-day, is to see sin as a thing of convention and convenience; incidental to a set of conditions or a point of view; at highest, sin is seen as an act or fact which in some way injures or hinders the welfare of the race on earth. Of course, sin is always an injury to society; but we need to see it as an offence against God. Pride, for instance, is not only blinding and ridiculous: it is sinful. Luxury is not only shameful when evident and disastrous when indulged: it is sinful. Anger is not only weak and often mischievous: it is sinful. And sin is an attack on a Personal God who resents it; a thing for God to forgive, perhaps; but a big thing to forgive; a thing, however, which *must* be forgiven, or we suffer; a thing of shameful malice aforethought. Sin is active treachery and rebellion against our Supreme and Final Lord. And God is not mocked.

But Our Lord points, too, to the magnificent generosity of God to those who humbly ask forgiveness. He does not need our loyalty or friendship or service. He is God: complete and perfect in Himself: needing nothing and nobody. He requires these things from us because by these alone can we achieve our personal perfection, the sanctification of our soul, our destiny. It is for our sake that He requires them. He wants our service because He loves us. And we know that He has expressed His generosity in tangible form in the Sacramental system of the Church.

The third lesson of the parable is that we must shew a proportionate readiness to forgive our neighbour, under penalty of earning the divine indignation. It is the hall-mark of His followers: "By this shall men know that you are my disciples, that you have love for one another." And again: "I say to you, love your enemies; do good to them that hate you." Peter insisted on it; Paul insisted on it; the New Testament is full of it. The martyrs obeyed with Stephen at their head: "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge" (Acts vii. 59). And in giving us, as ever, His own example, Our Lord not only prayed for His murderers, but found it in His Sacred Human Heart to make excuses for them: "Father, forgive them: they know not what they do."

Twenty-second Sunday after Pentecost (October 25th).

Gospel. (Matthew xxii. 15-21.)

EXPLANATION: The unholy alliance between Herodians and Pharisees shewed bad faith from beginning to end. And Matthew the ex-publican was alive to it. So was his Master. The tribute in question had been imposed by Pompey, to be paid if required. Julius Cæsar has insisted on its payment. And Augustus made it an annual poll tax.

The Herodians had accepted Pompey's conquest, and agreed to pay tribute to the Romans as defenders of the State and pre-

servers of public order. They were also inclined to look on Herod, the Roman-appointed king, as the Messiah. But the Pharisees, the ultra-patriots, denied both Herod's messianic pretensions, and the lawfulness of the tribute. "We are the children of Abraham," said they, "we have never been slaves to any man." They clung to a sentence in Deuteronomy (xvii. 15): "Thou mayest not make a man of any other nation king."

But in punishment for their infidelity, Jahweh had already put the nation under foreign yoke. The pious King Ezechias had paid tribute. Jeremias had warned the people not to rebel against Babylon. Esdras and Nehemias had accepted Persian supremacy. Jahweh was no longer their civil ruler. And there was that significance, too, in Our Lord's words to Pilate: "My kingdom is not of this world."

The crooked effort to entrap Our Lord into a political quarrel of this kind, of course, failed. He flatly calls them hypocrites, and points out that by accepting the coin as current for tribute, they had accepted the authority of him who issued it: they had acknowledged their subjection to Cæsar. It is Cæsar's coin: so give it back to him. And give back to God the things that are God's.

We should notice that Our Lord did not determine for them whether the Jews were or were not subject to Cæsar, nor whether the tribute was just and equitable. That would have been to walk into the trap that they had set for Him; a trap set with malice, and baited with flattery. He simply left them to dis-mantle it as best they might, or remain themselves entrapped. His answer was in logical sequence to their production of the coin bearing Cæsar's image and inscription.

REFLECTIONS: In these days of increasing State-control, this lesson is very valuable.

Man normally must live in social communion with his fellows. The organization of the attendant social relationships results in the State. (This does not mean "nationalism.") The State is thus one of the products of God's Providence, and is itself subject to God. God is the source of all authority held by the State or by any other creature.

The State is juridically competent to provide the means necessary to its own end, the temporal welfare of its subjects. It is thus a society distinct from the Church. In all purely temporal matters—those which are necessarily a help or hindrance to temporal welfare, and in no way a help or hindrance to spiritual welfare—the authority of the State is supreme, and independent of the Church. And to that extent, but no further, it is true to say that Religion must leave politics alone. Those were the politics which Our Lord left alone; those are the politics which the Church leaves alone.

But in matters that are necessarily a help or hindrance to spiritual welfare, and of no significance for temporal welfare, the authority of the Church is supreme, and quite independent of any permission or enablements from the civil power. In

matters that are both spiritual and temporal at once, both jurisdictions may enter; and a clash is then possible; and there must be some principle of solution.

Church and State both exist on this same earth: both have the same men and women as subjects: both need some of the same means of activity. They are thus in relationship. A relationship of equality is clearly impossible in these circumstances. The State must be subordinate to the Church: not directly indeed, since the State is competent to secure the validity of the acts necessary for its own end, but indirectly. This means, first, that the State has no authority to do anything injurious to the Church; and secondly, that the State must give the help which the Church judges necessary for her own end. In any clash of interests, the State must give way; since eternal welfare cannot be subordinate to temporal. Objectively the Church has pre-eminence over any State, since every State is subject to God's will. But as God's will in this matter is not everywhere known, the Church cannot everywhere exercise her pre-eminence. But always and everywhere the Church must resist acts that are hostile or gravely prejudicial to man's spiritual welfare. In matters purely temporal, she claims no right to interfere. In matters purely spiritual she asserts her sole authority. In matters touching both spiritual and temporal interests, the Church must have the last word. In these matters, to cry "Keep Religion out of Politics" is to betray a muddled brain.

God has no need to claim the things that are Cæsar's: all are already His. But all through history Cæsar has been claiming things that are God's. We see the efforts of princes to get their own men made Bishops, and so keep a hold on their revenues. We see their efforts to secure the Pope as their tool, if not as their subject. We remember the remark of Charles V, of France, when the first anti-pope came to Avignon: "Now I am Pope." We remember the support given to the political religion of Luther by the rebel German princes, half strangled by debts. We remember Parliamentary Gallicanism, and the Organic Articles of Napoleon. And in our own day we have seen this claim inflated to bursting-point in Italy: "Everything in the State: nothing outside the State: nothing against the State"; or something equally preposterous.

That is the spectacle to-day: the feeble thought that Religion should never "interfere" in Politics; and the arrogant paganism that denies to Religion any rights at all save those which the State may give it.

But the first Pope saw that the position was clear in his conflict with the civil authority. "Commanding we commanded you not to preach in this Name; and you have filled all Jerusalem with your doctrine; and you have a mind to bring the blood of this man upon us"; thus the Council. "But Peter and the Apostles answering said: we ought to obey God rather than man" (Acts v. 28).

The position had been clear from the day when Christ said: "Render to Cæsar the thing that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's."

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. LITURGY AND CEREMONIAL.

BY THE VERY REV. M. S. CANON MACMAHON, B.A.

President of Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, Dublin.

THE Sacraments, next to the Holy Mass, exercise the most powerful of all influences upon the sanctification of men and the ordered progress of society. Everybody recognizes in more or less degree how they affect individual souls. Their relation to the Church as a whole, as Dom Wintersig points out, is not always sufficiently stressed. They make us "feel with the Church," their rites and ceremonies are permeated with the spirit of the Church and saturated with its doctrines—and more particularly so because they have a most intimate and direct relation with the Church.

By Baptism we become members of the Church. By Confirmation we achieve full citizenship in the Church. The Blessed Eucharist unites us more closely with the Body of Christ which is the Church, while Penance restores the union with that Body which sin had relaxed. Extreme Unction prepares the Church in its members for the coming of the Lord. Matrimony symbolizes the union of Christ with His Church, and Holy Orders not only prolongs the sacerdotal life of Christ on earth but constitutes also the *ministerium ecclesiae*. The better we understand the Sacraments the deeper our reverence grows for the Church and the more clearly we recognize our duties in its regard. Is not our duty to exercise Catholic Action—that necessary and irreplaceable means whereby the Church is to fulfil its mission—based to a large extent upon the obligations we incur in Baptism and Confirmation and upon the priesthood of Christ in which we share by the reception of these Sacraments?

To help to a better appreciation of the Liturgy of the Sacraments I confine these notes practically to the comparatively recent works which treat of those means of grace and sources of light.

Le Baptême, par Rene Dubosq, P.S.S.,¹ is the first volume, though the second in order of publication, of *Les Etapes de la Vie Chrétienne*, which Fr. Dubosq has undertaken to write in his desire to produce an analytic and reasoned presentation of the Catholic Sacramentary. May good fortune wait on his enterprise!

A study of the rite of Baptism makes one realize with a vividness not elsewhere easily attainable the dignity of the Christian vocation and brings home to one a true sense of

¹ Bayeux, Grand Séminaire.

the privilege of being an adopted child of God. The knowledge of the *régime* of the Catechumenate makes one understand the implications and obligations of Baptism. The rite of Baptism itself acquires a new meaning in the light of such knowledge. Baptism is essentially a communion in the death, in the burial and in the resurrection of Christ. Having disappeared—literally true when the whole body was immersed—under the waters of Baptism, we participate in the death and burial of Christ and coming to the light again we rise with Him “full of grace and light.” Easter Sunday, then, is the yearly anniversary of our Baptism, and Lent, spent in the spirit of the Catechumenate, the preparation for the celebration of it. Fr. Dubosq helps us greatly to the realization of all this. Theology, Christian archæology, history, ascetic and spiritual literature in general are availed of, possibly too largely, to illustrate the theme and enlighten our mind. Making allowances for excessive detail, he certainly achieves his purpose to present in the analysis of the rite those historical and dogmatic details which give the most accurate and objective idea of the sacramental life “so that one may more truly appreciate it, desire it, and live it.” Such knowledge is truly power.

La Sainte Communion dans la Liturgie Catholique, par l'Abbe Leon Cristiani,² is a fresh and original book, whose central thesis is that it is the Eucharist which unites men to God and men with one another. Communion is an essential need of our nature. We must be in communion with God, Author of our nature, the beginning and end of all things, the eternal source of truth, justice, sanctity and love. But communion with God is inseparable from communion with our fellow men. The purpose of the liturgy is to realize one and the other of these communions. In the liturgy the most expressive rite to bring about communion is the Eucharistic Banquet. The communion is there realized in such an intense degree, that the rite itself is called Holy Communion. The Eucharist is the mystery of the love of Jesus Christ for God and for man. It is also the means placed at our disposal to express our love for God and to bind us closer to our brethren. In instituting the rite of Holy Communion, the first purpose of Christ was to unite Himself to us and us to Himself. His other purpose was the union, or rather the unity, of His Mystical Body which is the Church. In the Catholic liturgy all converges towards the Eucharist, at once Sacrifice and Sacrament, and thanks to the Eucharist the liturgical year reproduces all the phases of the life of Jesus. These two wonderful results were achieved little by little. The author carries us through the centuries, tracing the development of the Eucharistic rite in the East and in the West, and leads us up to the conviction that the Eucharist is the secret of the Christian revelation; it alone can change the face of the world. Every time that poor weak man retires from the Holy Table he bears in

² Avignon, Aubanel Fils.

his bosom the *panis angelicus* consecrated by the word of Christ, and finds that without effort, as if naturally and instinctively, he fulfils the two great commandments which give life its eternal significance and value: the commandments to love God above all and to love one's neighbour as oneself. This book, the substance of which I have summarized more or less in the author's own words, is at once an illustration and a model of what education through the liturgy may be.

We next come to three books concerning Holy Orders: *Le Pontifical Romain, Histoire et Commentaire, Tome I^{er}*, par Dom Pierre de Puniet;³ *Les Etapes du Sacerdoce, ou Présentation Analytique des cérémonies de l'Ordination* (Quatrième Edition), par René Dubosq;⁴ *Le Sacrement de l'Ordre*, par Emile Jombart, S.J.⁵

Mgr. Battifol, in his introduction to Fr. Dubosq's volume on Holy Orders, holds that the Pontifical is the most magnificent liturgical book which we possess. It prescribes the words and gestures for the most solemn acts in the life of the Church. Nowhere is the language of the Church "more sober, more moving, more dignified." Dom Puniet, one of the authors mentioned above, is at present engaged on the special Committee appointed by the Holy Father to revise the Pontifical, and it is hoped that the many difficulties it presents will not wait too long for solution.

Fr. Jombart touches only lightly on the ceremonies of Ordination. His treatment is moral and canonical rather than liturgical. He quotes an interesting decision of the Holy Office in 1890 regarding a Chinese who, in conformity with the etiquette of the country, kept his head covered during the Ordination ceremony and thus during the imposition of hands. He was told not to be in the least perturbed.

Fr. Dubosq writes his book for those who are anti-clerical and entertain contempt for priests in order to show them from the fountain source what the priesthood really is. He writes for those who are about to be ordained, that they may have a real understanding of the grandeur of the priesthood, and he writes for the parents of ecclesiastical students that they may realize the nature of the sacrifice which God demands of them. One sees how the Pontifical, which is held in such reverent awe as scarcely ever to be opened save at an episcopal function, may be broadcast to the humblest Catholic home. Fr. Dubosq leaves nothing unsaid in footnotes.

Dom Puniet gives a fuller history of the Pontifical than that given by Mgr. Battifol in his *Etudes*, and proceeds to analyse the Ordination ceremony in a really entrancing way, finding most unexpected parallels in distinct functions. In discussing the concelebration of the Ordination Mass he points out that

³ Paris, Desclee de Brouwer et Cie.

⁴ Bayeux, Grand Séminaire.

⁵ Paris, Editions Spes.

concelebration extended formerly beyond the Mass to the administration of the Sacraments. Like co-operation takes place in the Consecration of the Oils on Holy Thursday, where the priests are *assistentes pontifici, ministerii sacri chrismatis cooperatores*. The new priests are called in the consecration prayer of the Preface *cooperatores ordinis nostri*. He suggests that the general Communion of the clergy that takes place in some churches on Holy Thursday is a last vestige of the ancient celebration. In discussing the rite he notes that the invitatory after the imposition of hands by the Bishop and priests is not properly a prayer of consecration, and that logically the right hands should remain extended during the following prayer, but the authoritative decision holds good that the right hands are not to be extended during the second prayer *Exaudi*.

I once heard a well-known Belgian priest say that the Retreat which impressed beyond all compare the priests of Malines was one based solely on the Pontifical. I can well understand it after reading Dom Puniet's exposition of the Ordination ceremony.

Nor is Dom Puniet less impressive in his treatment of Confirmation in the same volume. Confirmation to most of us is a ceremony which we went through in our childhood and the memory of which is almost blotted out from our minds. The knowledge of the rite, which is not above the meanest intelligence, shows that in Confirmation "the Holy Ghost comes to live in the soul and to confer on it, at least in germ, all the supernatural energies which will aid it all through life in working out its salvation. It is for the Holy Ghost to teach it to act well, to take over the conduct of all the spiritual life which begins with Baptism and Confirmation. In the measure in which souls enriched with His gifts show themselves supple and docile to His inspirations He will act for them and lead them to the accomplishment of good works." The general celebration of Confirmation Day at Pentecost, with an instruction on the sacred rite, would place that great Sacrament, the Sacrament of Catholic Action, in its true perspective. Dom Puniet points out that the *Pax tecum* at the end of the rite is a souvenir of the kiss of peace which the Bishop used to give to the newly baptized after Confirmation, and that the stroke on the cheek which accompanies the salutation is of more recent origin.

La Liturgie Nuptiale, par L'Abbé A. Croegaert, Professeur au Grand Séminaire de Malines,⁶ is, by a happy thought dedicated to the pious memory of the father and mother of the Little Flower, "models for Christian spouses." The author endeavours to set forth the beauty of the nuptial liturgy so as to deepen reverence for the sacrament and rechristianise the hearth and home. The grandeur of the matrimonial contract, which Christ has raised to the dignity of a sacrament, lies in its duty of

⁶ Abbaye de Saint-André, Lophem-lez-Bruges.

"multiplying saints, of peopling the world with children of God by grace, and of peopling Heaven with elect in glory." Too little attention is given in the education of young men and women to the development of St. Paul's teaching that Christian marriage symbolizes the mysterious union of Christ with His Church, and too little attention is given to the study of the liturgy of Marriage, from which two sources would be derived a deep and reverent respect for their future mission. Fr. Croegaert draws upon these sources of knowledge and presents us with a thesis on Christian marriage which is full of reverence and inspiration. The analysis of the Nuptial Mass and of the Nuptial Blessing furnishes a most excellent means of instruction on marriage. Instruction through the medium of the liturgy would not fail to create a high ideal of Christian marriage without any pandering to idle curiosity, and would provide a radical corrective to the false notions of the hour. A book like *La Liturgie Nuptiale*, which contains much that is special to Belgian customs, is in no conventional sense "a long felt want" *apud nos*.

The Handbook of Ceremonies for Priests and Seminarians, by John Baptist Mueller, S.J., translated from the ninth German edition by A. P. Gauss, S.J., and A. C. Ellis, S.J.,⁷ has developed into a first-class handbook, giving most detailed and reliable information on the rubrics and ceremonies of those ecclesiastical functions and duties which enter into the ordinary life of a priest and of his parish. It deals with the Mass, Low and High, the functions of the Church's year, the Sacraments and Sacramentals, the Divine Office, Public Vespers and Compline. The seminarist will profit by it, though for clearness sake one would wish that the Divine Office were treated with greater fullness. The priest will find in its precise and concise method a ready reminder of those ceremonial and rubrical niceties which with passage of time escape the memory of the most rubrically minded of us. What deserves special comment and praise is the Musical Supplement of some twenty pages which gives in staff notation the various tones of Prayers, Lections, and of all that the Sacred Ministers sing at Mass or Office—a unique and splendid feature which adds much to the value of the book.

With courage Fr. Mueller faces the vexed question as to how Holy Communion should be distributed by a second priest during the Mass of a celebrant at the High Altar. He assumes the correctness of interrupting the celebrant and gives directions as to how the celebrant should act during the momentary interruption (p. 316). Though this practice is approved of by "the great and the good" one is inclined to think it is against all liturgical tradition. Where communicants are in vast numbers and helping priests are necessary, would it not be better, awaiting any official decision, to take a hint from the *Ceremoniale Episcoporum* (L. II, c XXX, n. 5) where, for Easter Sunday in the absence of the Bishop, it is laid down that, if communicants be

⁷ Herder, 9s.

numerous, Holy Communion may be given by a priest other than the celebrant *in alio altari seu capella?*

II. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY.

BY THE VERY REV. DOM BENEDICT STEUART, O.S.B.

THE summer is always the quiet time for publishing, and therefore it may be admitted frankly that nearly all this year's books capable of inclusion in this category have been dealt with in the two preceding articles on the subject. There are still a few, however, which have not received notice so far. "Of making many books there is no end," says the Preacher. If this was true in his day, how much more so is it true in ours! The sage, if rather cynical advice, "When a new book is published, read an old one" has certainly much to commend it where spiritual reading is concerned.

To avoid disappointment, it is wiser to rely mainly on recognized masters, whose works have stood the test of time—and, it may be added, of place, that is, of different countries, nationalities. Among such masters we may reckon Père J. P. de Caussade, S.J., whose valuable instructions on prayer have just been published in an English form.⁸ The same author's well-known treatise on "Abandonment" (*L'Abandon de l'Ame*) and the *Spiritual Letters*, compiled and published long after his death, have been available in English for some years, and this further volume completes his output. As the Abbot of Downside remarks in his introduction, this latter work will gain considerably when brought into relation with the whole ascetical doctrine of the author.

Père de Caussade is an interesting figure in the history of prayer. Entering the Jesuit Novitiate of Toulouse in 1693, only five years after the condemnation of Molinos, he lived at a time when the anti-Quietist reaction had unhappily caused all contemplative prayer to be viewed with suspicion. Things had gone so far that, in the phrase of one of Caussade's editors, "the finest flower of Catholic spirituality lay in danger of being crushed utterly out of existence." Père de Caussade set himself to the task of improving the situation, and his efforts, marked by a wise caution—He produced his only published book anonymously and in the form of an explanation of Bossuet's *Etats d'Oraison*—were crowned with much success. His book was reissued again and again, although usually in an incomplete form, since the first part of it, which deals with Quietist errors in detail, was not regarded as of much general interest. Père de Caussade is not, perhaps, a guide for everyone. To quote the Abbot of Downside again, "Many pious people have not reached

⁸ *On Prayer: Spiritual Instructions on the various states of prayer according to the doctrine of Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux.* By Jean Pierre de Caussade, S.J. Translated into English by Algar Thorold with an introduction by the Abbot of Downside and a preface by the late Fr. Ludovic de Besse, O.S.F.C. (Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 6/-, 1931.)

anything like the level he assumes in the cloistered nuns to whom he imparts the spirit of their father, St. Francis . . . many others will have advanced beyond his advice, which will seem to them true but trite. Others will be more 'mystical,' with more sense of God and more definite 'graces' than Caussade presupposes, and they may have to go by a higher road. But yet his general teaching of 'abandonment' must be true for all, though possibly in a different dress for each,"⁹

Acts and Affections for Mental Prayer, By Dom B. Weld-Blundell, pp. 149.¹⁰ The late Dom Benedict Weld-Blundell deserves much gratitude for all he has done to popularize the writings of Dom Augustine Baker and his disciple, Dame Gertrude More, and it is very fitting that his last published volume should be this little compilation drawn from the writings of both holy Benedictines. The "prayer of acts" might be called Fr. Baker's speciality, and his teaching in regard to it finds witness in the lives of numberless holy souls during the past three centuries. The "acts" here given are an abridgement of those printed several times before, notably at the end of most editions of *Sancta Sophia*, but they are revised and arranged more in accordance with modern taste, and an excellent introduction explaining their use and value is added. It is a pity, however, that some of the Latin acts and aspirations have not been retained, both since, to use Fr. Baker's expression, some souls find more "gust" in the Latin, and since it is always good to familiarise the laity with the official language of the Church.

The Secret Way of the Enclosed Garden: after the Blessed Louis-Marie Grignon de Montfort. By Francois Pilet, S.M.M., translated by C.M.D.B. With a foreword by the Bishop of Menevia.¹¹ The Bishop of Menevia's delightful foreword is a very strong recommendation in favour of this compilation from the Blessed de Montfort's writings on *True Devotion to Our Lady*, and His Lordship is certainly right in pointing out the theological correctness of the devotion. Nevertheless, we may be permitted to doubt if the devotion is "a way or method suited to any soul, any nation, any race" (p. v.). It is true that in England we need a "less timid, less suspicious outlook upon Mary's place in the scheme of the Redemption." We are too inclined to be afraid of anything that seems, to the English mind trained in an atmosphere of Protestantism, to be exaggerated or to exhibit too much feeling or emotion.

But, in this case, it is not so much a question of nationality, as for types of spirituality which are found alike in all nations. That the "True Devotion" is a help to many souls, we are convinced, but we are equally convinced that such souls belong to a

⁹ pp. xxx. and xxxi.

¹⁰ Sands. 2/6.

¹¹ Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1931, 5/-.

special type—one that has need of “ways” and “methods” in the spiritual life over and above what the Church provides in her Liturgy and over and above what is provided in the simple form of spirituality which we find, for example, in the work of Père de Caussade, mentioned above. There are many souls who are hindered, not helped by such “devotions” or “ways” or “methods.” It is not that they despise them, considering themselves to be in too high a sphere of the interior life to be in need of them. It is simply because, for such souls, anything “special”—any “method” is an impossibility.

Surely we dare not say that such people are any less thorough-going in their love of God’s Mother because they have not adopted the practice of the “Holy Slavery of Mary.” It is impossible for any soul to be in really close union with our Lord without being, at the same time, in really close union with our Lady—Jesus and Mary cannot be separated. But for those for whom the “True Devotion” is a help, this book no doubt will be of very great use.

The translation, though carefully done, is in some places rather too obviously a translation.

Three Studies from St. Paul. By Fr. J. M. Bover, S.J., translated from the Spanish by M. O’Leary.¹² Fr. J. M. Bover, S.J., has written a small book, but just as an egg, though small, is “full of meat,” so is this booklet full of deep thought and solid spiritual doctrine.

Fr. Bover puts before us what we may call the marrow of St. Paul’s teaching concerning the “Mystery of Christ” in the three studies which make up this little volume. These three studies are closely connected. The Apostle’s teaching on the Sacred Heart (this is no anachronism, except in terminology!) leads naturally to the thought of “Mystical union in Christ Jesus” and this latter to the consideration of the “Fulness of Christ,” for union with Him means both union with the fulness of grace and with the fulness of the Divinity itself.

In the first study—on the Sacred Heart—Fr. Bover speaks most appositely of the “profound theology on which the devotion is based,” and he goes on to show the “Pauline character” of the teaching of St. Margaret Mary to which that devotion as now practised, owes so much. This is a fact of supreme interest and importance, for objections brought against this devotion have often been based on its supposed modernity, or sentimentality. Nothing could be less “modern” or less sentimental than the teaching of the great Apostle of the love of Jesus, and it is on that teaching, as Fr. Bover shows, that devotion to the Sacred Heart in reality is founded.

In his second study, Fr. Bover is careful to explain that “Mystical union in Christ Jesus” does not mean union with

¹² Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 3/6.

the *humanity* of Jesus Christ as such, but with His divine Person itself, inasmuch as this Person has assumed a human nature and subsists in it. In other words, it is a mystical union—not with the Godhead alone, nor with the Sacred Humanity alone (if that were possible) but with God Incarnate. The precise question at issue is “whether mystical union takes place formally with God, as God, or whether it takes place also with the Man Christ, that is, if the Man Christ can be the formal and immediate term of that union” (p. 50). Fr. Bover comes to the conclusion that this latter proposition is possible and essays to prove it by his study of St. Paul’s epistles, and he offers, as an example, the case of St. Margaret Mary Alacoque. Whether this conclusion will be accepted unreservedly by all mystical theologians remains to be seen.

Certain articles on subjects connected with prayer that have appeared in various English reviews lately, deserve at least a passing mention. For example, Abbot Chapman’s article concerning the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius in the *Downside Review* for January, 1930, and Fr. Martindale’s rejoinder in the *Month* for April and June, 1930. Short studies of this kind will often yield more practical direction than formal treatises, besides being easier to read, so they should not be overlooked. Particularly informing it seems to us, is a budding controversy which has arisen in the *Dublin Review* on the teaching of St. John of the Cross. Although this consists only of one article and a very brief reply to it, and is so far a layman’s controversy, we think it deserves some attention from our clerical brethren. This controversy is of real practical importance, for it is concerned with the type of sanctity which St. John represents, treating as it does of his whole attitude towards the visible creation. It is also concerned with the question as to whether St. John is to be considered as a spiritual master whose doctrine applies to only a very few of the faithful—a spiritual élite—or whether it applies to all those, in general, who aspire after holiness.

The discussion mentioned opened in the *Dublin* for January last with an article by Mr. Montgomery Carmichael, who has long been known as a student of St. John’s writings. Mr. Carmichael believes that there is “a tendency among a growing number of spiritual writers to emphasize the natural, poetical and literary gifts of St. John of the Cross to an extent which too much obscures his qualities as a saint transformed to an exceptional degree in a close and constant union with God.” According to him the appreciation of art and letters with which such writers credit St. John would be on St. John’s own showing quite fatal to the high degree of union with God which was his. He instances an article by Archbishop Goodier in the *Month* of July, 1929, as expressing such opinions, which he regrets to find also in the writings of Fray Silverio, O.C.D., editor of the new critical edition of the saint’s works, (Burgos, 1929), but the main part of his essay is an attack on a recent

remarkable study of St. John,¹³ by a brilliant young friar of his own Order, Fray Crisogono de Jesus Sacramentado. Mr. Carmichael complains that in this work an entirely new St. John is presented to us: "A Saint of sorts is still there, but a restless preoccupied saint. The great man of genius whom the saint had hidden with Christ in God is brought out from this ineffable sanctuary to the light of day, a poet, a man-of-letters, an artist, a sculptor, a musician, a lover of nature; and this man of genius, who by the mighty efforts of his own heroic soul and the merciful dispositions of Almighty God, has been freed from the natural forms of knowledge which went along with his many-sided nature, is presented to us in the full possession and enjoyment of all those impressions which would be fatal to the divine union which was his in so eminent a degree" (p. 35).

Against this view of the saint, Mr. Carmichael practically adopts as his own that of Dean Inge's *Christian Mysticism*, from which it is also necessary to quote to make the issue clear: "It is a terrible view of life and duty—that we are to denude ourselves of everything that makes us citizens of the world—that *nothing* which is natural is capable of entering into relations with God—that all which is human must die, and have its place taken by supernatural infusion . . . we hear nothing of the relation of the Creation to God, or *why* the contemplation of it should only hinder instead of helping us to know its Maker. The world simply does not exist for St. Juan; nothing exists save God and human souls,"¹⁴ and again "He would have us cut ourselves completely adrift from the aims and aspirations of civilized humanity!" On this Mr. Carmichael comments "No, not us; but only a very few chosen people who are to receive a pearl of great price in their stead." And he tells us that "we must carefully remember, throughout the whole treatise, that St. John is not laying down a rule of life for all Christians, but is writing only for the very few whom God desires to lead 'along the highest road of obscure contemplation and dryness.' Indeed he tells us specifically that he is addressing only certain of the friars and nuns of the Reform of Mount Carmel (*Ascent, Prologue para. 10*)"

If this were the case, if St. John's teaching were only suited and intended for a mere handful, then the matter would be ended, and so, too, would nearly all the saint's practical importance as a spiritual director. Souls who have attained any real humility, are always shy of singularity, and would be very unlikely to think themselves called to a way of spirituality, so unusual and extreme. In his enthusiasm for St. John, Mr. Carmichael does not seem to reflect that he is making him into a kind of St. Simon Stylites. Unfortunately for the truth of his theory, too, his reference does not by any means bear up his

¹³ *San Juan de la Cruz su obra científica y su obra literaria*, por el P. Crisogono de Jesus Sacramentado, O.C.D., Madrid and Avila, 1929.

¹⁴ *Christian Mysticism*, pp. 228-29.

contention. If we glance at the prologue referred to, we find that the saint does not say "he is addressing only certain . . . friars and nuns of his Order," but that that is his *principal* object, a very different thing. He says also in the prologue, that he writes "on account of the great necessities of *many* souls," he mentions that he writes "for beginners as well as for those who have made some progress," and he concludes by saying that his instructions are suitable, not for "those spiritual persons who desire to draw near to God in pleasant ways, but a solid and substantial doctrine suited to all, if they seek to advance to that detachment of spirit which is here described." What is there new or surprising in this? Where is the spiritual writer who does not warn his readers of the folly of expecting to draw near to God except by the way of the Cross?

In the April number of the *Dublin* appeared a letter from Mr. Robert Sencourt in reply to Mr. Carmichael, from which we may quote the following passage :

If St. John rhapsodizes over Nature before inviting the attention to rest alone in God, it is right of P. Crisogono to say that the saint delighted in Nature. And this not only his prose but his verse proves over and over again. The mystic doctor of the Church was not a Calvinist, nor a Manichee. But he insists that the mystic who seeks for union with Him who transcends Nature must turn his eye from it and above it. Then, communing with that uncreated beauty, he will enjoy the beauty of Nature and of Art in a better way than before, seeing the glory which shines behind it.

Obviously this is not the place for controversy, but it is possible that Mr. Carmichael has made the mistake of taking one side of St. John's teaching only, a mistake, the danger of which is so strongly insisted on in Friedrich Von Hügel's *Mystical Element of Religion*.¹⁵ That deep thinker argues repeatedly that the only way to understand St. John of the Cross rightly, is to set off one trend in his writings against another, and then to view the whole in the light of his practice, so far as this has been disclosed to us. "It cannot be denied," says von Hügel, "that were we to press his 'negative way' into becoming the only one . . . the whole system and rationale of External, Sacramental, and Historical Religion, indeed of the Incarnation, in any degree and form, would have to go, as so many stumbling blocks to the soul's advance." (*Myst. Elem.*, Vol. II, p. 343.)

Many highly relevant passages on the subject of human sensibility in all its forms in relation to mystical union will be found

¹⁵ Cf. also Bossuet's words, "Without adhering scrupulously to the expressions of the holiest men, or even to certain of their conceptions, we must compare them with each other and be content to penetrate to the fundamental meaning." (Quoted Caussade, p. 103.)

in the Abbé Hoornaert's study of St. Teresa lately translated as *St. Teresa in her Writings*. One long chapter devoted to "Her mystical states and her intellect" is particularly to the purpose. After a detailed examination, the Abbé gives as his judgment of St. Teresa that when "two years before her death she had reached what we may call spiritual perfection . . . her sensibility, aided by an imagination that had grown more restrained, became fine, delicate, and yet was still open to every human emotion. Her heart was moved at the sight of nature and expanded in warm and sincere friendships" (p. 170). The two great Carmelites, St. Teresa and St. John, who devoted all their powers to the same great cause, rose each to the highest degree of sanctity attainable on earth. If we accept the Abbé Hoornaert's conception as a true portrait of St. Teresa, are we to conclude that St. John of the Cross—her lifelong friend and spiritual adviser—walked to God along an altogether different path?

In his commentary on the Holy Rule of St. Benedict, Dom Delatte has an illuminating passage on the question of different types of sanctity. The Abbot says: "There is a virtue and a sanctity which we may liken to light that has been resolved thro' a prism. There are souls who have the spirit of poverty, or of mortification, or zeal and a kind of supernatural impetuosity, in an extreme degree. The spectrum of such sanctity contains a bar of vivid red, and men see it better, perhaps imitate it with less difficulty, tho' their gestures be awkward . . . besides the prismatic sanctity, of which we have spoken, there is a white sanctity, where all tints are merged in a perfect simplicity and equality. Such sanctity makes less stir; it is less noticed, and the unobservant do not notice it at all. But it is enough that God recognizes it as a more perfect likeness to our Lord and to His Mother."¹⁶

Perhaps the above passage may be taken as summing up the whole question.

¹⁶ *The Rule of St. Benedict*: a commentary by the Rt. Rev. Dom Paul Delatte. Translated by Dom Justin McCann. London, Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1921. p. 354.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

FOSTERING VOCATIONS AMONG ORIENTALS.

A pious association, which bears the appropriate name of "Catholic Union," has for its object the furthering of priestly vocations among Orientals. It was approved in September, 1924. Recently, however, at the petition of its President, Mgr. Besson, Bishop of Lausanne, Geneva and Fribourg, the S.C. for the Oriental Church issued a decree, dated January 6th, 1931, giving public recognition to the society and commending its aim, which is to labour in promoting and assisting in every way ecclesiastical vocations among native Orientals, and equipping seminaries for the speedier formation of an indigenous clergy. The society will do for the Eastern churches what the Pontifical Work of St. Peter the Apostle does for Latins. Existing seminaries in the East and in the West, and especially in Rome, have already, the decree reminds us, greatly facilitated the return of Oriental dissidents to Christian unity.

The revised statutes of the society are added, and the indulgences granted on September 18th, 1924, are renewed for ten years.

Members assist the work in whatever way they are able by prayer and financial help. The President General, whose nomination rests with the S.C. for the Oriental Church, will make an annual report of the funds subscribed, and the distribution will be controlled by the S.C. and the Commission for Russia, in accordance with the instructions of the Holy Father.

Diocesan branches of the society must not be founded without the permission of the Ordinary, to whose decision is left the introduction of this work into his diocese and the appointment of a diocesan President. (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 162.)

SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY.

A commentary on the importance which the Church attaches to the teaching of Scholastic Philosophy, and to canon 1366 of the Code, is afforded by a retraction made at the instance of the Holy Office by the Bishop of Piazza Armerina, one of the Suffragan Sees of Syracuse.

The following is a translation :

"I, the undersigned, purpose to withdraw, as I do in fact hereby withdraw, all that I have written and published in books, in the *Rivista di Autoformazione*, and in the review *La Tradizione* of Palermo, against Catholic doctrine, and against what the

Holy See and the Supreme Pontiffs, especially in recent times, have inculcated, recommended, and commanded concerning the study of scholastic philosophy in seminaries, in conformity, moreover, with canon 1366. Piazza Armerina, April 8th, 1931. (Signed) Mario, Bishop." (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 161.)

THE DISTRIBUTION OF INTERCALARY REVENUES.

As an elucidation of a canon of the Code, the following response of the S.C. of the Council, dated November 20th, 1930, is of general interest.

An redditus intercalares sive civiles sive naturales distribuendi sint in Italia iuxta annum solare seu civilem.

R. Affirmative. (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 16.)

The division of the annual income of a benefice between the new holder and his predecessor must be made, according to canon 1480, "pro rata temporis quo beneficio uterque deservierit . . . omnibus proventibus et oneribus currentis anni computatis, nisi legitima consuetudo aut pecuniaria statuta rite approbata alium iustae compositionis modum induxerint."

A doubt was raised by some of the Italian bishops, as to the precise meaning of "currentis anni," especially now that the Concordat itself (Art. 26, §1) makes the distribution of ecclesiastical revenues entirely dependent on the canon law. Where the annual value of a benefice varies, it may easily become a matter of some importance whether the year under consideration is the "solar" or civil year, beginning on January 1st, or the official "agricultural" or the "economic" year, which begin in Italy on November 1st and July 1st respectively. At least in reckoning the "natural" or "quasi-natural" fruits of a benefice, it would be a convenience to follow the agricultural or the economic calendar. In future, however, notwithstanding any difficulty there may be in assigning the *fructus pendentes*, such a wide interpretation of the Code will not be permissible.

BOOK REVIEWS

Moral Values and the Moral Life. By Etienne Gilson. Translated by Leo Richard Ward, C.S.C. (Herder, 1931. 337 pages octavo. 10s.)

Etienne Gilson's work was one of the first to appear in the well-known series *Les Moralistes Chrétiens* (Gabalda). The plan, less evident in the translation, follows closely the usual arrangement of a scholastic text-book on Ethics. We have the two-fold division, "Morale Générale" and "Morale Particulière," the first comprising the treatises *De Fine Ultimo*, *De Actibus Humanis* and *De Legibus*, the second *De Virtutibus in Specie*. This dependence on the traditional method of the schools is skilfully concealed in the translation and, I think, wisely so. For, in the world of thought outside of these schools, the impression is widely spread that Christian morality, especially when presented from the pages of St. Thomas, is chiefly concerned with doctrines which must be held on the authority of theologians. But those who are familiar with St. Thomas Aquinas know that, in establishing a norm or rule for human conduct, the chief appeal is to human reason, which perceives the natural moral law as a reflection of the eternal law of God. God the Creator is also the Legislator. The difficulty is to get others, who have not been trained in Catholic thought, to appreciate this profound truth. The author's preface, the most interesting portion of the book, analyses and describes the true position of St. Thomas in the history of human thought. His ethical system is not an ingenious invention but possesses the same authority and rests on the same basis as the truth of God's existence, and it is completed and adorned by the Christian revelation. "To summarise this first instinctive trait of the ethics of St. Thomas, we would say that it is a *Christian humanism*, meaning not that it is the result of a combining of humanism with Christianity, but that it is a witness to the fundamental identity of a Christianity in which the whole of humanism is included, an integral humanism that finds in Christianity its rounded satisfaction . . . we would call it a *Christian naturalism*—meaning by this not a balancing or running together of naturalism and Christianity, but that mere nature needs the Christian confession for its own perfect development, and that in turn Christianity needs a distinct nature that it is to perfect and save."

The substance of the text of the book ably supports the ideas outlined in the preface. It contains one or two features which are very often neglected by the manualists. The first is a very full treatment of the first five questions of the *I-IIae* of the *Summa*, *De Fine Ultimo*, in Chapter I. The *Summum Bonum*

(*Le Souverain Bien* of the French) appears as "The Master Value" in the English rendering, and *Finis Ultimus* as "The End of Ends." These two phrases are good examples of the translator's efforts to clothe scholastic thought in readable English. If the result is not always so successful, for example, "the word *end* has two senses that which and that by which" (page 25), this is due to the almost insuperable difficulty of translating Aristotelian—Thomistic terminology. Another excellent feature, is the presentation of the second portion of the book (*Morale Particulière*—"The Moral Life in Practice") which consists in a positive treatment of the virtues, with Charity in the first place.

Both the book and the translation have excellent qualities, and it will be found extremely useful for students who have mastered the usual text-book matter and desire a fuller and more scientific treatment of the subject. But I do not think it would be true to say that the book is well-adapted for the general reader who has no previous knowledge of scholastic terminology. A work of this kind, in English, remains yet to be written.

E. J. MAHONEY.

Peregrinus Goes Abroad. By the Rev. Michael A. Chapman. (Herder. 8s.)

Judged strictly by the criteria of the elusive, but seemingly easy, art of fiction-writing, Father Chapman's book is flagrantly faulty. There is no characterization; the two priests, the Antiquary and the Liturgiologist, who do most of the talking, express themselves in exactly the same style. There is also a lack of verisimilitude; priests do indeed frequently discuss matters of technical interest, but their discussions do not amount to a whole time business. Father Chapman's heroes are as keen on their subjects as they are on motoring, and find no difficulty in combining animated argument with high speed. Their language is a rich mixture of American colloquialisms and slang, not a few expressions being comprehensible only by guess work on the part of the English reader. They have a prodigious acquaintance with Canon Law, Decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and Approved Authors, and can roll off chapter and verse with enviable glibness.

We draw attention to these weaknesses not by way of condemnation, but rather of sharpening the point of our approval, for the book is successful in that it holds the reader's interest from beginning to end, is also amusing, and admirably achieves the author's purpose. Father Chapman has compounded a pill pleasantly covered with sugar, but sufficiently strong to stimulate sluggish minds. Habits of study and serious reading are soon lost by those who have to live a life of perpetual rush; in their quiet moments they are too tired to occupy themselves with textbooks and decrees.

For such as these Father Chapman's book should be highly beneficial, for in a form which can be followed without effort, he imparts an abundance of information on a diversity of subjects pertaining to the Liturgy. His heroes are chiefly concerned with Ritual, Rubrics, and Ceremonies, and in perusing their droll discussions one realizes how easy it is for even the most assiduous and devout priests to slide into little irregularities, and how necessary is an occasional glance at the drill books of the Church. The Antiquary and his friend the Liturgiologist are consumed with the *zelus domus*. They tilt good-naturedly at their negligent brethren, but reserve their sharp thrusts for "Sartor & Co." and "Catalogus," and other purveyors of decadent ecclesiastical wares which, in defiance of Decrees, the clergy accept "because they are handy, and save bother and money." They severely criticize what they call "the cart-before-the-horse" system of conducting sacred functions: under this convenient expression they condemn those who subordinate the essentials of the liturgy to "extra-liturgical parades," who obscure the dignity of liturgical services by allowing "the good sisters" and others to add fantastic introductions of their own, and a host of other abuses to which unfortunately we have become inured. Very amusing are the chapters which narrate the adventures of the two friends in Rome; they make startling discoveries, but also receive some unpleasant shocks.

The book has a certain charm of its own and is highly instructive. *Peregrinus Goes Abroad* is yet another indication of the healthy interest which our American brethren are taking in the glorious and widespread movement of liturgical revival.

J. P. REDMOND.

Der Tabernakel Einst Und Jetzt. By Felix Raible. Freiburg im Breigau, Herder. Price now reduced to 3 marks.

This book was remarkable in its day and is still regarded as a valuable contribution to the history of the Tabernacle and incidentally of the Altar. Despite the more monumental and more recent work of Fr. Braun, S.J., on the Altar, Raible will be found worth reading. The book is thorough and well illustrated. One bit of advice he gives should be taken to heart. Every priest who is building a church or erecting an altar should study carefully the liturgical regulations governing altars and tabernacles, and put the architect wise in these matters before the plan of the church or of the altar is drawn up.

M. S. MACMAHON.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

The July (Quarterly) number of the *EPHEMERIDES THEOLOGICAE LOVANIENSIS* devotes its four articles to the glory of Our Lady. Professor J. Lebon writing *Autour de la définition de la foi au Concile d'Ephèse* (431) gives his readers the most masterly exposition of the history of the Council they can ever hope to read. Terse and to the point the facts are placed before us on the authority of the documents we possess and many hitherto unnoticed details are seen to shed a flood of light on the much-discussed proceedings. The momentous simplicity and speed with which the condemnation of Nestorius was conducted is brought home to us by a quotation from Duchesne (III, 350). We then are taken to the documents themselves and to our amazement we find that practically every single assertion in it calls for correction. If the article contained no more than that warning against implicit trust even in a great historian it would have been worth writing, but it does far more than that, and we are brought to see in the method followed by St. Cyril a calm and scientific judgment far removed from the petty spitefulness sometimes imputed to him. M. Lebon's analysis of the first sessions stresses the doctrinal rather than the disciplinary issues raised. We see that the Bishops were familiar with all the documents in the case, and after all, the doctrinal teaching of the Council was approved by the Pope's Legates on July 11th, 431.

The Fathers of Ephesus, unlike the members of most Councils, in defining the faith, drew up neither Creed nor Canons, and, in fact, at no moment did the idea of doing so enter their minds. The only question with which they were concerned was: "Which of the two conflicting Christological expositions is really in harmony with the Creed of Nicæa?" St. Cyril knew that the term *Theotokos* was not in the Creed, but his indirect argument was: "As our Lord Jesus Christ was true God of true God, the Virgin who bore Him was *Theotokos*." Nestorius appealed to the same Creed which he explained in his own way. The famous "Twelve Anathematisms" of St. Cyril were framed in terms of Nestorius's explanations and that is the key to their authentic interpretation as St. Cyril himself indicates time and again. Moreover, quite apart from anything St. Cyril says about them a careful study of their sources points to the same conclusion.

In a brilliant piece of literary criticism following up his historical criticism, M. Lebon shows the extraordinary pains taken by St. Cyril in order to obtain a perfectly objective statement of Nestorius's teaching. When we compare the collection of passages drawn from the works of Nestorius which was read at the Council of Ephesus, it is clear that the "Anathematisms" are based upon the Nestorian documents there assembled. It is

clear again that St. Cyril's five Books *Adversus Nestorii blasphemias*, written before the Third Letter to Nestorius and the "Anathematisms" destined to accompany it, were based upon the same carefully gathered *florilegium*. The result of M. Lebon's elaborate comparisons is another glorious vindication of the much-maligned St. Cyril and of the thoroughly objective and scientific character of his work even if judged by modern critical standards.

"On y reconnaît, en effet, une méthode de travail et un souci d'objectivité dont les études positives se font une règle et une gloire. C'est sur des textes que l'évêque d'Alexandrie opère pour découvrir et présenter les idées de son collègue. Son attention et sa défiance sont éveillées par les sermons de Nestorius qui parviennent en Egypte et y met en émoi les milieux monastiques. Il se procure les documents, les examine, et en fait des extraits qu'il joint à la lettre par laquelle il avertit le pape Saint Célestin. Il poursuit ses recherches; il enrichit sa documentation et lorsqu'il entreprend la réfutation de ce qu'il croit erroné dans l'enseignement de Nestorius, il dispose de textes nombreux, choisis, étudiés et classés, que lui ont fournis les écrits mêmes de son adversaire. C'est de ces ressources qu'il use pour essayer de convaincre et de ramener, par ses lettres, celui qui s'égare toujours d'avantage; c'est de là qu'il tire les douze propositions qu'il le met en demeure de souscrire pour fermer définitivement toute échappatoire à la subtilité de son obstination; c'est encore cette documentation qui lui permet d'adapter aux anathématismes un florilège nestorien auquel il les appuiera devant ses collègues à Ephèse. On a souvent suspecté et même flétri les mobiles qui auraient guidé l'évêque d'Alexandrie et les moyens qu'il aurait employés dans ses controverses et ses luttes avec son 'rival' de Constantinople. Il n'est pas mauvais, il est juste même, de noter le soin avec lequel il s'est appliqué à connaître les enseignements de Nestorius par les écrits mêmes dans lesquels celui-ci les avait consignés. Avant que le 'Pharaon,' si l'on veut, ne partît en guerre, l'érudit s'était pourvu de textes, et le théologien les avait scrutés" (pp. 410-411).

From the pages of Cardinal Newman most English readers are familiar with the figure of Theodoret. A friend of Nestorius and of John of Antioch, he was bitterly opposed to St. Cyril of Alexandria. John of Antioch as early as August, 431, had accepted "Theotokos" as the expression of his faith, and laid the basis of the future act of union of 433. Theodoret lingered in ostensible heresy and schism until the Council of Chalcedon, when he turned on Nestorius with a violence only comparable to that which swayed him in earlier days against St. Cyril. Père d'Alès gives us an illuminating study of *La lettre de Théodoret aux moines d'Orient*, a work written at the end of 431 or the beginning of 432. When we examine the document we are astonished to find that a man of the acumen of Theodoret could possibly have discovered in the "Anathematisms" of St.

Cyril all the enormities which he enumerates—it is an outstanding example of the tyranny certain mental habits may exercise. There is little doubt about Theodoret's fundamental and intentional orthodoxy, though he finds it hard to break with certain Antiochean formulas. But it is quite obvious that he did not understand the meaning of the terms St. Cyril used and had explained time and again.

In the August BLACKFRIARS Mgr. Barnes sets out the arguments which appeal to him in favour of *The Holy Shroud of Turin*. G. M. Durnford praises the records which give us *Gregorian Chant on the Gramophone*. S. F. Darwin Fox gives us four trenchant pages on *The False Fruits of Modern Democracy*. Cathal O'Byrne writing *Charlotte Brontë goes to Confession*, supplements Charlotte's well-known letter with some details about her Catholic grandmother. Under the heading *Casement and Ireland* Richard O'Sullivan gives some account of Denis Gwynn's book and adds some noteworthy considerations on the pre-war trend of special legislation in the interests of the population of Ireland—essentially opposed as it was to the principles animating the parallel legislation for Great Britain. *The Making of a Friar-Preacher*, by Fr. McNabb is an inspiring lecture given at the opening of the year's studies at Hawkesyard, and will be found of use to all Seminary Students.

THE THANET CATHOLIC REVIEW is a new venture of the Monastery Press, Ramsgate (Quarterly, 2s. 8d.), it gives us the history of the foundation of St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate, and of its three Abbots (Alcock, Bergh and Egan). There follow notes on *The Thanet Missions* (Ramsgate, Deal, Margate, Broadstairs, Minster, Westgate, Birchington) and some interesting details on the life of Augustus Welby Pugin.

COLLATIONES DIOECESIS TORNACENSIS (July, 1931) opens with an interesting lecture on *Les Origines du petit Séminaire de Bonne-Espérance*, by L. Chevalier. M. Grégoire treats of *Le préjugé en histoire comparée des religions. Un spécimen*. The example given is the first rate work of the Copenhagen scholar Dietelf Nielsen, who has devoted his life to the interpretation of old southern Semitic inscriptions, some seven thousand of which have been found in Northern and Southern Arabia and in Abyssinia, ranging in date from 1000 B.C. to the first Christian centuries. Nielsen explains Christianity on the hypothesis of borrowings from earlier religions, he rejects Babylonianism as the source: it is too complicated, too highly developed. He reconstructs an earlier, ruder, form of semitic religion from his inscriptions, and from that starting point he works out the national evolution of religions until it merges with that founded by Jesus of Nazareth. The learned Semitic scholar cannot see beyond his very highly specialized domain and sets out to explain theological teaching he has never troubled to master.

Serious students of Eugenics will be glad to have their attention drawn to an excellent article by M. Kiselstein, *L'Eugénique*

in the July REVUE ECCLESIASTIQUE DE LIEGE (30 francs a year, six numbers, rue de l'Evêché, Liege). After a general introduction the Eugenic Movement is considered in its general trend, its methods, and the problems presented to modern Catholics. While recognizing that many Eugenists have the best intentions in the world, the writer points out that they consider man simply as an animal creature and forget all moral and supernatural values. At the same time they tend to exaggerate the power of the State, and in fact seem to be favourable to the thesis of State Absolutism. He notes the turn of the Rake's Progress in the suggestion of Dr. H. Langhlin, of the Eugenics Record Office, an authoritative American specialist, who suggests sterilizing all classes incapable of satisfying the demands of society, and brings into that category the feeble-minded, the insane, criminals, epileptics, drunkards, all who suffer from chronic infectious diseases (consumptives, syphilitics, lepers, the blind, those who suffer from pronounced deafness, the deformed, the merely dependent, orphans, the homeless, vagabonds and the poor).

In the MONTH for August S. L. Kennan gives a good account of the work of the Kolping Society: *How Catholic Germany stems the Leakage*. The title of the article promises too much, but it is well worth reading nevertheless. *Is it really Faith?* by Fr. M. C. D'Arcy, is a discriminating criticism of Professor A. E. Taylor's "The Faith of the Moralists." "This outline," says Fr. D'Arcy, "will show how fundamental is the difference between this faith and that of the Catholic, despite similarity of language and the use Professor Taylor makes of Catholic writers and Catholic terms. When, for instance, he argues from moral conceptions to the supernatural truths of the Christian religion, he is stating what has been considered immemorially as an extreme heresy by the Catholic Church, and as this is his main theme, we can see how true it is that his Catholic conclusions follow from premises which are not ours." Fr. Leo Hicks concludes his series of articles on *Father Parsons, S.J., and the Seminaries in Spain*.

CORRESPONDENCE

MASS WITHOUT A SERVER.

I am in charge of a newly-founded parish in a country district and frequently have no one to serve Mass on weekdays. Could permission properly be asked for, in these circumstances, to say Mass, on occasion, without a server, and even with no one in the Church?

REPLY.

The general law is found in Canon 813: "Sacerdos Missam ne celebret sine ministro qui eidem inserviat et respondeat. Minister Missae inserviens ne sit mulier, nisi, deficiente viro, justa de causa, eaque lege ut mulier ex longinquo respondeat nec ullo pacto ad altare accedat." Between having a male server, properly instructed and apparelled, and having no person at all in the Church, there may exist many degrees of deficiency.

(1) Any reasonable cause, for example, the desire of the priest to celebrate, justifies the assistance of an incompetent minister—one who cannot answer the responses correctly or who is ignorant of his functions. (It is presupposed that the lack of a competent server is not due to the priest's negligence). In these circumstances the celebrant need not be scrupulous in directing the server what to do, but should quietly make good the defects himself. (Capello, *De Sacramentis*, §740.)

(2) It is gravely unlawful to allow a woman to take the place of a server at the altar. The authors are commonly agreed that it is preferable to have no server at all. (Many, *De Missa*, §140.) But it is always lawful, for a proportionate cause, to allow a woman to kneel at a distance from the sanctuary and answer the responses. In such cases the celebrant must previously take care to have everything essential at hand, in order to obviate the necessity of the woman coming upon the sanctuary during the celebration of Mass. The proportionate cause or necessity justifying this practice is not easy to determine. Two replies of the Congregation of Rites tolerate the practice *urgente necessitate* (*Decreta Authentica*. 2745 and 4015). A reply appeared in the *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, 1893, XXVI, p. 572, answering *NEGATIVE* to the following query: "An urgens dici potest necessitas in casu quo sacerdos sacrosanctum missae sacrificium celebrare non potest, quod minime necessarium est neque ad sacramentum pro infirmo conficiendum, nec ad preceptum implendum." This severe interpretation was afterwards withdrawn and it does not appear in the *Decreta Authentica*. The desire to say Mass is, therefore, sufficient reason justifying the practice in cases where a male server cannot be had. The practice is fairly universal of celebrating Mass in the oratories of nuns, without a male server, even in cases where the law could quite easily be observed. This can be held as a legitimate custom, I think, until it is abrogated by the competent authority.

But in public churches the practice is lawful only when a male server cannot be had. If the lack of a male server is habitual, an Indult should be obtained. (Cf. an example of such an Indult January 30th, 1920, Vermeersch *Periodica*, 1923, p. 43.)

(3) The Indult just quoted states: "Curet tamen idem orator habere . . . saltem aliquem virum aut mulierem qui intersit sacrosanctae missae sacrificio et populum repraesentet." It is gravely forbidden to celebrate with no one at all in the church, for the Mass is, of its nature a public function. Three instances are commonly given by the authors, justifying the celebration of Mass *sine ministro*, but they do not make it clear whether their teaching applies to saying Mass in an empty church. (Capello, §741; Many, §139; Gasparri, §646.) From the context, however, I interpret their meaning in the liberal sense. It is lawful, namely, to celebrate in an empty church (a) in order to administer Viaticum to the dying; (b) to satisfy the precept of a Mass of Obligation, on the part of the priest; (c) if the server departs after the Mass has begun. Outside these cases of urgent necessity, the practice is gravely unlawful, except when permitted by Indult, which is often granted for foreign missions. There is an instance of Indult nearer home which is worth quoting. It was communicated by the Bishop of Soissons to his clergy on October 17th, 1922: "Nous autorisons les prêtres du diocèse de Soissons qui y célèbrent, à le faire sans servent, et même sans une personne répondant à distance de l'autel, et même encore sans aucun assistant dans l'église ou la chapelle, quand il y a impossibilité de faire autrement. La faculté dont Nous faisons part vise non seulement les Messes de précepte, mais aussi les Messes de dévotion." (*Documentation Catholique*, VIII, 1922, p. 1,244.)

When Mass is celebrated without a server to answer the responses, the Confiteor should be said only once (*Decreta Authentica*, 3,368), *nostri* should be said instead of *vestri* in the *Misereatur* (Capello, §741), and *meis* instead of *tuis* in the response to *Orate Fratres* (*Ritus Servandus* VII, n. 7).

E. J. MAHONEY.

THE FORMATION OF THE VIRTUE OF CHASTITY.

Can it be said that the use of such books as *The Difficult Commandment* and *Into Their Company* is to be discouraged in view of the recent instruction issued by the Holy See?

The first of the books mentioned is for boys, by Fr. Martindale, S.J., and the second for girls, with an introduction by the same author. They are written for adolescents. (Manresa Press; Burns, Oats and Washbourne.) The decree of the Holy Office is given in *The Clergy Review*, Vol. I, p. 637.

These two excellent books are not affected by the decree. On the contrary they embody its teaching, which is merely a restatement of the traditional attitude of the Church. Books of the class *What a young boy ought to know* have always been viewed with disfavour by ecclesiastical authority. (Cf. the decree of the

Congregation of the Index, given primarily to the Spanish Bishops, as far back as January 18th, 1908.) On the other hand, Catholic books on the subject have been in circulation abroad for many years, and some of them appear to have exceeded the limits desired by the Church. A correct understanding of the decree requires a reference to the Papal encyclical on education (December 31st, 1928). The Holy Father, after condemning the practice of giving sexual instruction "to all indiscriminately, even in public," writes as follows, "In this extremely delicate matter, if, all things considered, some private instruction is found necessary and opportune, from those who hold from God the commission to teach and who have the grace of their state, every precaution must be taken. . . . Speaking generally, during the period of childhood, it suffices to employ those remedies which produce the double effect of opening the door to the virtue of purity and closing it upon vice." What the Church condemns is physiological and anatomical instruction on the sexual function, of a purely secular character. For no amount of knowledge can take the place of the religious and supernatural means of forming habits of virtue, the use of the Sacraments, the practice of mortification, and devotion to Our Lady. Nevertheless, as the Holy Father says, some instruction may sometimes be necessary and opportune. I think it can be said that it is more likely to be necessary and opportune in this country, for the religious and respectable classes of the population are only just emerging from a mawkish mid-Victorian attitude concerning child-birth, which was almost regarded as something obscene, and about which it was considered necessary to tell lies, if children asked questions. This is an English Protestant tradition, not a healthy Catholic instinct, although our English Catholic outlook has not been unaffected by it. Witness, for example, the bowdlerising of St. Francis De Sales' *Devout Life* in the popular translations previous to the one made by Fr. Ross in the Orchard Series. He speaks openly and beautifully of the marriage bed, in the full light of Catholic devotion, and it was chiefly because of this book that its author is a doctor of the Church.

Owing to the prevalence of town life and the lamentable limitation of births, even in Catholic homes, many children will not discover, by their natural observation, the origin of life. Even if they do not ask questions, they sometimes need to be told, for it is difficult to see how they can have a rudimentary idea of the value of chastity unless they understand that the desires and emotions of the flesh are not irregular in the married state, because, in that state, their divinely appointed purpose can be achieved. The person who gives this information should do so discreetly and reservedly. Otherwise, as the Holy Father says: "It may happen that instead of extinguishing the fire, he unwittingly stirs or kindles it." The instruction should be given religiously, as something perfectly obvious and elementary, and it must be adapted to the age and temperament of the child. In most cases it will not be necessary to say anything about the

subject at all. For these reasons collective public instruction is wrong, and Catholics will have to resist attempts to introduce it into the curriculum of schools. The best person to take the responsibility is the parent or, failing the parent, those who have the commission to teach. If these persons feel that they can best discharge their duty, in a given case, by giving the child a book to read, I know of no better books than the two mentioned.

E. J. M.

TWO WILLS AND A BEQUEST (A Further Note).

Since the reply on page 659 of the June number was printed, we have heard, with the greatest regret, that Rev. Dominic Prümmer, O.P., died at Fribourg on June 9th. He was a Moral Theologian and Canonist of the highest repute and gave the best years of his life in the service of the University of Fribourg, where he was universally loved and admired. His solutions have frequently been quoted in answer to correspondents. On page 660, the opinion was given that his teaching would probably be modified in view of the Roman decision quoted. One of his students kindly sent the following communication which may be of interest to our readers. "Since the official decision of Rome on the point, he no longer held his previous position. Moreover, he asked me to make the following change in his Manual, Vol. III, n.277.3: "*Si agatur de testamento ad causas pias . . . controvertatur num valeat . . . Sententia forte probabilis negabat, quam praecipue tenent Cardinalis d'Annibale, Daelman, Haine, Retzbach. Videtur esse conforme Codici Juris Canonici statuente c. 1513 §2 . . .*" (Notice the second sentence is entirely omitted, also the reference to Tanqueray.) He then quoted the decision of the Codex Commission to which you refer . . ."

E. J. M.

CUM PERMISSU SUPERIORUM.

s
e
e
n
a
.

e
;
n
s
s
y
e
d
s
t
e
e
l,
.
s
l,
ci
y
e

=

=